A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS

JOHN EVANS

Wm. John
Tony Pandy

A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS OR THE WELSH PEOPLE

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY

REV. JOHN EVANS, B.A.

CHEAP EDITION

LONDON

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW

1903

PREFACE

THE purpose of this book is to present to ordinary readers a clear and continuous narrative of events and of persons in the history of the British, or Welsh, people. The author has not written for the instruction of learned and historic critics, but for plain people generally. For this purpose he has avoided encumbering the pages with learned footnotes which might be interesting to critics but unprofitable to general readers. The authorities which have been consulted in the composition of the work are mentioned or quoted from in the course of the narrative.

It is well known that Welsh people generally are very imperfectly acquainted with the history of their own country and race, and what knowledge they have is often mixed with mythical elements which are inconsistent with modern historical criticism. To remove this ignorance has been the aim of the author, but to what extent he has succeeded must be determined by others. He has been guided not by the spirit of prejudice or flattery to national pride, but by the love of truth. The old Welsh sentiment has been kept in mind, " Y Gwir yn erbin y Byd "—" The truth against the world." This saying was the motto of ancient poets, and is placed at the head of documents issued by " The Royal Eisteddfod of Wales."

Nearly all the histories of Wales hitherto published have terminated at the conquest by King Edward I. at the close of the thirteenth century. It has been assumed that the history of Wales after the conquest has been comprehended in the history of England. This has been largely the case, especially the political history. There have been, however, many important facts in the life of the Welsh people which have not been recorded by English historians, or only superficially treated. The peculiarities of Welsh nature and life have been largely overlooked or unfairly represented by many English authors. These facts justify a special history of Wales, or the Welsh people, apart from the history of England. Several praiseworthy attempts have been made to supply this want, but there may be room for another work that may record some matters imperfectly described or omitted by others.

During the nineteenth century the ancient literature of Wales has been placed before English readers in editions prepared by the Government and in translations made by competent scholars. The large number of British writings which for ages were preserved by distinguished Welsh families as old MSS. have been placed before the public, and show how great and ancient the Welsh literature

has been. In this volume an outline description of this literature is given. A full and minute account is difficult, if not impossible, within the limits prescribed. Such an account is not necessary or desirable for the persons for whom this work is intended. What has been here supplied will enable ordinary readers to form a definite conception of the literary activity of the ancestors of the Welsh people.

It has not been found easy to present a consistent and harmonious account of a people like the Ancient Britons, who were divided into various provinces—kingdoms, principalities, tribes and clans. The history of a united kingdom and a homogeneous people is much simpler. The *unity* of the government and people is a fact that enables a writer to co-ordinate and subordinate the complex phenomena of national life; but when a race is broken up into fragments, as was the case with the Welsh people of ancient times, and subjected to varying influences, the difficulty of bringing the facts into one harmonious view is much greater. In such a task it is almost impossible to avoid some measure of repetition in narrating the movements of the different tribes, &c.

It is generally admitted that the Celtic race is more emotional, poetic, and religious than the Anglo-Saxons. This applies to the Brythonic or Cymric branch of the race. The tendency to the apprehension of the spiritual, the eternal, and the supernatural is conspicuous in the nature and history of this race. It would be impossible to write a history of this race without including the phenomena of religion. Accordingly the author has endeavoured to describe the earliest form of religion in Britain, including the Druidical, and the natural religion which the Ancient Britons maintained in common with the other nations of Europe. The early introduction of Christianity into Britain is brought under review. The native Church of Britain and its independence of Rome and Canterbury are described and traced through its long struggle from Augustine until the conquest under Edward I.

In connection with the history of religion it would be impossible to pass over the origin and development of Nonconformity in Wales in comparatively modern times; hence an account is given of the religious denominations among the Welsh people. This has been done with a due regard to historical fairness.

Such as the book is, the author commends it to the perusal especially of Welshmen, and also of Englishmen. The manuscript was completed nearly two years ago, and its publication was postponed owing to the attention of the public being absorbed in the war in South Africa. The author had not heard of any other work in preparation by other writers before he had finished his own work, otherwise he might not have entered upon his task.

JOHN EVANS.

CHELTENHAM, *November*, 1901.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

THE EARLIEST HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS 1

CHAPTER II

THE RACES OF ANCIENT BRITAIN 5

CHAPTER III

THE TRIBES OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS 16

CHAPTER IV

THE CHARACTER OF THE COUNTRY 23

CHAPTER V

THE CHARACTER OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS 29

CHAPTER VI

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS—DRUIDISM 34

CHAPTER VII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS AND THE ROMANS—THE INVASIONS OF JULIUS CÆSAR 42

CHAPTER VIII

THE BRITONS AND THE ROMANS UNDER CLAUDIUS 54

CHAPTER IX

PAGE

THE BRITONS AND THE ROMANS UNDER AGRICOLA AND HIS SUCCESSORS 67

CHAPTER X

THE ROMAN OCCUPATION 73

CHAPTER XI

THE INTRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIANITY IN BRITAIN 78

CHAPTER XII

THE BRITONS AFTER THE DEPARTURE OF THE ROMANS . . 85

CHAPTER XIII

THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS, A.D. 449–577 . . . 89

CHAPTER XIV

THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS—CONTINUATION OF THE CONTEST 97

CHAPTER XV

THE CYMRY PROPER—THEIR OPERATIONS 103

CHAPTER XVI

RELIGION AMONG THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS—THE BARDS OF THE SIXTH CENTURY 110

CHAPTER XVII

THE BRITONS IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY 125

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SEPARATE BRITISH STATES IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES 131

CHAPTER XIX

THE ANGLO-SAXON HEPTARCHY 142

CHAPTER XX

PAGE

THE CONVERSION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS 154

CHAPTER XXI

THE DANES AND THE NORWEGIANS 165

CHAPTER XXII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES . 186

CHAPTER XXIII

THE ANCIENT LAWS AND INSTITUTES OF WALES . . . 192

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ANCIENT BRITONS DURING THE CENTURY 950–1050 . . 200

CHAPTER XXV

THE ANCIENT BRITONS UNDER THE NORMANS 205

CHAPTER XXVI

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES 218

CHAPTER XXVII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES—(*continued*) 254

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE LITERATURE OF THE BRITONS, OR THE WELSH, UP TO THE CONQUEST IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY 301

CHAPTER XXIX

THE CHURCH OF WALES 326

CHAPTER XXX

WALES IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES . . 344

CHAPTER XXXI

PAGE

WALES IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY—ABOLITION OF THE MARCHES —THE REFORMATION 365

CHAPTER XXXII

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 371

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 378

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY 403

INDEX 409

CHAPTER I

THE EARLIEST HISTORICAL ACCOUNTS

The country which we now call England, Wales, and Scotland was known in ancient times under the designation of Britain ; in Latin, Britannia. The origin or derivation of the name has been a subject of discussion. Some native historians, such as Nennius, who lived in the ninth century, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, who flourished in the twelfth century, derived the name from Brutus, a Roman consul, who, after conquering Spain, reduced Britain to subjection to Rome. The historian traced the Britons through Brutus to the Romans, and through them again to the Trojans. This method of writing history has been called mythical, which consists in the creation of facts from an idea, which facts are thus pure imagination. This method was common in ancient times in Rome and Greece. Accordingly, the story of Romulus and Remus was invented by the oldest Roman writers to explain the origin of the name of the city Roma, as derived from "Romulus." The explanation of the name Britain as derived from Brutus must be laid aside as pure imagination.

According to Canon Taylor, in his interesting book, "Words and Places," the name is not derived from the Celtic or the classic languages. He thus expresses his opinion (pp. 44, 45) : "But the Celtic aborigines do not seem to have called themselves by the name of Britons, nor can any complete and satisfactory name be discovered in any of the Celtic dialects. . . . The word, however, is utterly foreign both to the Greek and the Latin speech." Then he goes on to show that, after searching all the languages spoken by the diverse races who have found a home on these shores, he turns to the remaining ancient language of Western Europe, and concludes : "We find that this name is derived from that family of languages of which the Lapp and the Basque are the sole living representatives ; and hence we reasonably infer that the earliest knowledge of the island which was possessed by any of the civilised inhabitants of Europe must have been derived from the Iberic mariners of Spain, who either in their own ships or in those of their Punic masters, coasted along to Brittany, and thence crossed to Britain at some dim prehistoric period. The name Br-itan-ia contains, it would seem, the Euskarian suffix *tan*, which is used to signify a district or country, or, more correctly,

clan is the plural of *an*, the suffixed locative preposition, or sign of the locative case."

There is something plausible in this explanation, and it agrees with the prevalent opinion now held by scholars that the aborigines of Britain were not the Celts, but the Iberians, a non-Aryan race who preceded the Celts in the occupation of many parts of Europe. At least the Iberians were a branch of the race or races who formed the original immigrants into Western Europe. The opinion must be taken for what it is worth. It is perhaps not possible to determine the question absolutely. The Britons themselves called the country Cymru, and the most ancient authorities Britain. This name has been continued in use through all the ages, amidst the changes of circumstances and the succession of races. England, Wales, and Scotland are modern compared with Britain ; and when the whole country is intended to be designated the name Great Britain is now employed. And the United Kingdom is called Great Britain and Ireland. The King is also designated, especially in diplomatic documents, " His Britannic Majesty."

The earliest mention of Britain is found in Greek and Roman authors. Some of their references are indefinite and their explanations doubtful. Western Europe was very imperfectly known by the ancient Greeks and Romans until the time of Julius Cæsar. The father of Greek history, Herodotus, who lived in the fifth century B.C., described the inhabitants of the extreme west of Europe under the name of Cynetæ, or dogs ; and that beyond and next to them were the Celts, who occupied the Cassiterides, or Tin Islands, from which the Phœnicians obtained their tin. This reference is, of course, very indefinite. The " Tin Islands " have generally been identified with the Scilly Islands, some distance from the coast of Cornwall. The modern name seems to suggest this. The more precise opinion of recent times is that the words designate not merely the Scilly Islands, but Cornwall and some other places, even in Spain, where tin was obtained. In the fourth century before Christ, the Greek philosopher Aristotle refers to Britain under the name of Albion, and Ireland by the name of Ierne, as two large islands called Britannia which were situated in the ocean beyond the Pillars of Hercules, which we identify as the Straits of Gibraltar. The work of Aristotle on the world which contains this reference to the island of Albion as one of the Britannic group of islands has been ascribed to some other author, and later in time. The name Albion, however, was subsequently used to denote this island, especially by Pliny in his work on Natural History, written in the first century of the Christian era. According to some critics, the Roman name Albion, meaning white, was applied to Britain because the white cliffs of chalk would strike the ancient mariner in his approach to the shore from Gaul. It appears, however, that the name Albion was also given to a part of the country, to Scotland—the kingdom of Alban, or Scotland beyond the Forth. In the opinion of Professor

Rhys, the word is not Latin but Gaelic, and that its original meaning is entirely lost; and, possibly, it is not even a Celtic name at all.

Polybius, the Greek historian, was born in B.C. 202 and died aged eighty-two. He wrote several historical works on Greece and Rome, most of which have perished. His writings may certainly be dated about 150 years before Christ. He wrote a separate treatise on the tin production, which has been lost, in which he gave a description of the method by which tin was obtained and prepared in the Britannic Islands. He seemed to have been familiar with this important article of trade, which then was monopolised by the Phœnicians and Carthaginians.

Strabo was a distinguished Greek historian and geographer, who flourished in the latter half of the first century B.C., and is supposed to have died about A.D. 20. He was a well-informed author, and travelled much in Greece, Italy, Egypt, and Asia, and gathered up all the information he could relating to the countries of the world. In his works, which were numerous, he gave an account of the attempts of the Romans to discover the country from which the Phœnicians obtained tin, which for a long time was an important article of their commerce, and which they kept a secret.

The Carthaginian Hamilco was sent by his government on a voyage of discovery in the years B.C. 362–350. Amongst other places, he visited the Tin Islands, which he called the Œstrymnides, near Albion, and two days' sail from Ierne, or Ireland. It is generally understood that by these words he meant the islands on the coast of Cornwall, and Cornwall itself.

Diodorus Siculus was a native of Sicily, and lived in the first century B.C. He was the author of many books, most of which have been lost. He gave in his writings an account of the travels of Posidonius, who came to Britain and visited Cornwall, which he called Balerion. He must have made himself acquainted with the nature of the tin trade, and the manner of its preparation, and he was the source of the information which Diodorus gives in his historical account. From this account we learn that the tin was conveyed from the place of its production, in Cornwall, to an island, supposed by some to be the Isle of Wight, and designated *Ictis*. The island is said to be in part of Britain, and suits the position of the Isle of Wight, but there is no certainty on the point. The tin was purchased in the island by native merchants, and conveyed to Gaul, and carried overland on pack-horses to the mouth of the Rhone, a distance of thirty days' journey. Some writers have inferred from this description that the place whence the tin was transported to Gaul was in the south of the island, or Thanet, opposite the coast of Gaul, which was the usual way of traffic between Britain and Gaul ; others now identify it with St. Michael's Mount.

In the fourth century before Christ the merchants of Massilia, or Marseilles, determined on a voyage of discovery to the West ;

and they sent in charge of this expedition an able man, whose name was Pythias. He was an eminent mathematician, and well fitted for his enterprise. This was about 330 years B.C. The work which contained the narrative of his journey has perished, but fragments have been preserved in the works of several ancient writers. From these we learn that Pythias sailed round the coast of Spain and visited Brittany; thence he proceeded to Britain, and landed in Kent and several other parts of the country. He then sailed to the mouth of the Rhine, went round Jutland, and advanced as far as the mouth of the Vistula. Then, apparently, he visited Norway, and then returned to Britain, afterwards again to Brittany and the mouth of the Garonne, where he discovered an overland route to Marseilles. During his two visits to Britain, in going and returning, he made some observations by means of his mathematical instruments, and ascertained many things concerning the native Britons. He noticed the corn in the fields, and the manner in which the farmers gathered and threshed the wheat, and the kind of drink they made and used. Pythias probably visited only the southern part of the country, and did not go to the west, but he saw enough of the land and the people to enable him to describe their industrial life. This was long before the Romans became acquainted with the country and the people, and his account shows that then, more than 2,200 years ago, the ancient Britons were not the barbarians that some writers have represented them.

The above is the substance of what we learn of ancient Britain from the earliest writers who lived before the Christian era. Much of what they wrote was in relation to the trade in tin, which in those days was considered wonderful, and was carried on by the Phœnicians, and afterwards by the Carthaginians, who were colonists from Phœnicia. The Phœnicians kept the knowledge of the source of their tin trade a secret, and did all they could to prevent all other nations from learning the secret. This, of course, could not always be done, hence Greeks and Romans gradually acquired the knowledge. The tin trade has continued in Cornwall up to the present time, and there can be no doubt that this was the centre of the trade when the Phœnician mariners visited Britain long anterior to the birth of Christ.

The invasion of Britain by Julius Cæsar in the 55th year before Christ led to a better acquaintance with Britain and the Britons; and our knowledge of the country and the people in that distant period is largely derived from his account given in the work, "De Bello Gallico," and from the Roman historians who succeeded him in the first century of the Christian era, when the country was conquered and occupied by the Romans. The information thus acquired will be brought out in the following chapters of this work.

There are no native authors to whom we can refer for any instruction relating to so distant an age. The earliest of them flourished centuries later, such as Gildas, who belonged to the sixth century A.D., and whose narrative is more mythical than historical.

CHAPTER II

THE RACES OF ANCIENT BRITAIN

Who were the aborigines of Britain—the men who first occupied and cultivated the land? The prevalent opinion in former times was that the Celts were the original inhabitants. This was the common representation of English historians. The Welsh themselves never doubted that they have descended from the aborigines, who were Celts, and Celts of the Brythonic branch, as distinguished from the Irish, who have sprung from the Goidels, or Gaels, of ancient time, the other branch of the Celtic race.

In olden times history was largely manufactured under the influence of theories. The Greeks and Romans framed their ancient histories in this manner, which in modern times have been designated mythical, which essentially consists in the creation of objective facts from mere ideas. It is, consequently, not to be wondered at that the ancient history of Britain, which was largely composed by bards, or poets, was of this nature, mythical. It is, however, generally conceded that myths have often some elements of fact underlying them.

The history of Britain was in past ages contained mainly in the poems of bards, and presented in the garb of poetry. One form of the history may be condensed in the following lines :—The Cymry dwelt originally in the summer country, bearing the name of Deffrobani, and supposed to be the place on which Constantinople was afterwards built. The ancient poet Taliesin described the Britons as "Men of Asia from the land of Gafis," supposed to be on or near the sea of Azof. In this primitive seat of the Cymry there was a great man, named Hugh Gadarn, or Hugh the Mighty, who was connected with an ancient flood, from which he rescued a few individuals, male and female, who became the original inhabitants of Britain. This Hugh, who seems in the narrative like the Noah of the Old Testament, was the first to use vocal song. In these ancient times Britain had no inhabitants except wolves, bears, and water monsters, and the land bore the name of Glas Merddin—the island of green hills. Hugh Gadarn led the Cymry from the east to this country over the German ocean. They came also to Brittany in Gaul, then called Llydaw. Amongst those who followed Hugh Gadarn were Aedd Mawr, or the Great, and his son Prydain. The latter gave his name to the country,

Ynys Prydain, or the Isle of Prydain. This Prydain was also the first to establish a body politic and a sovereignty in the island. Then there arose Dyfnwal Moelmud, and he became the great legislator for the tribes and the entire country. These three men were called the three pillars of the tribes of the Cymry.

In this ancient mythical account there were three honest tribes in the Isle of Prydain recognised. The first was the race of the Cymry, who came under Hugh Gadarn, and peacefully occupied the country. The second was the stock of the Lloegrwys, who came from the land of Gwaswyn, or Gascony, in Gaul, but descended from the Cymry. The third were the Brythons, from the land of Llydaw, or Brittany, and they were descended from the primitive stock of the Cymry.

This story is, of course, mythical; but there are some facts underlying it. The Celts did originally come from the East, and they did occupy Gaul, and from there came to Britain. The distinctions of tribes expressed by the words Cymry, the Lloegrwys, and the Brython had a foundation in fact. They were all branches of the Celtic race. The story of Nennius, previously referred to, that Britain derived its name and its people from Brutus, is also mere myth. The results of critical investigation are different. The migrations of various groups of mankind have been traced in outline to the primitive home of the race somewhere in Central Asia. From this centre successive migrations proceeded at intervals of time to the East, to India, and elsewhere; and to the West to the various countries of Europe, the latest wave pushing the previous one forward. Then different groups would gradually settle down, and undergo those changes of appearance and customs arising from varied climates and circumstances which would make them separate nations, and speaking modified forms of the one language which they possessed at the commencement of the movements. This specially applies to the Aryan peoples and languages, which now embrace most of the peoples and the languages of Europe and India. The Celtic race belongs to the family of the Aryans, and the Celtic language is a branch of the Aryan speech. The fuller explanation of these conclusions will be made in the following development of the story. The Celts were the earliest immigrants from the primitive Asiatic home, moving on through various countries, settling in Gaul, and thence proceeding to Britain.

The above is the modern scientific explanation of the formation of the nations and the languages which we now find in the world. The migrations described took place in prehistoric times, and scholars come to the knowledge of the facts, not from any precise history, which in the nature of the case was impossible, but from an examination of the languages of mankind and their relation to each other; and from the marks which these successive waves of population have left behind them in the countries through which they passed. The race or races which over the world formed the first migrations have apparently been largely lost in the mixtures

of the population, especially in Europe, and have been swallowed up in the more vigorous peoples who succeeded them. The existing races in Europe were not the original occupiers of the countries, but succeeded them, and conquered and absorbed them in the course of time.

After the original immigrants came into Europe, successive migrations of a new and different race followed them, and these are now mainly represented by the modern nations—Greeks, Italians, Germans, French, and Britons. Among the earliest immigrants into Europe, and the earliest into Western Europe, were the Celtic race. In the course of their progress they left behind them portions of the race in various countries. The ancient Gauls, who occupied the large country we now call France, were mostly Celts. Modern Frenchmen may have pride in designating themselves a Latin race, but this is in opposition to the facts of history. The French of this age are like other peoples, a mixed people, but they have mainly sprung from the ancient Gauls, who belonged to the Celtic race. From Gaul the Celts passed over the Channel and took possession of Britain and Ireland, after conquering and driving before them the aborigines of the country. The Celts came into Europe apparently along the Mediterranean, and, passing through Germany, finally settled in Gaul and Britain. Their progress has been described by scholars by the numerous marks which they left behind them. They were driven westward by the advancing waves of other races, such as the Germans, until they settled in Britain as their final destination.

The marks of their progress through Europe have been clearly observed in the course of learned investigation. Canon Taylor, in his work, "Words and Places," thus describes the subject :— "The mighty Celtic immigration is the first which we can distinctly trace in its progress across Europe, forced onward by the succeeding deluges of the Romance, Teutonic, and Sclavonic peoples, till at length it was driven forward into the far western extremities of Europe." He proceeds to observe that there were two great branches of the race speaking the same language with dialectic differences—the Gadhelic and the Cymric, and then remarks :—"Although both of these branches of the Celtic speech now survive only in the extreme corners of Western Europe, yet, by the evidence of local names, it may be shown that they prevailed at one time over a great part of the Continent of Europe, before the Teutonic and Romance nations had expelled or absorbed the once dominant Celts. In the geographical nomenclature of Germany, Switzerland, Italy, France, Spain, and England, we find a Celtic substratum underlying the superficial deposit of Teutonic and Romance names. These Celtic roots form the chief available evidence on which we can rely when investigating the immigrations of the Celtic peoples."

He then proceeds to show that the names which the great rivers and mountains of Europe bear are derived from the Celtic speech. The words Avon, Dwr, Esk, Rhe, and Don, which enter into the

names of European rivers, are Celtic. The words pen, cefn, dun, bryn, rhos, craig, tor, cwm, and others which are found in the names of hills, and ridges, and strongholds through many parts of Europe, are also Celtic. These names designate the large rivers and hills of Europe, and they bore these names from prehistoric times, and they clearly indicate that the Celtic race occupied these countries in their gradual progress to the West from their primitive home in the East. This conclusion is not the result of pure speculation or mythical imagination, but is founded on facts. In a popular history, which we intend this to be, it would be tedious and perhaps uninteresting to go into minute and learned explanations of names of places and rivers, tracing them to original sources and their primitive roots. The general result of learned investigations, carried on during this century by ethnologists and linguists, given above, must here suffice.

According to the teaching of modern science, the mass of mankind and their languages have been reduced to three great groups, or classes. The first group has been named the Turanians, which formed the prehistoric and aboriginal race of most countries. In Europe they have been generally lost by gradual absorption in the races which succeeded them. Their language or languages, have mostly shared the same fate. There are some remnants in Europe of this great group who are found, as the Basques of Spain, the Finns and the Lapps of the North, and the Hungarians. The languages of these peoples are different in general structure from those of Europe generally, and evidently belong to the race who were the original or aboriginal inhabitants of Europe. The first inhabitants of Britain belonged to this group. They were in the occupation of the soil when the Celts crossed the Channel from Gaul, and occupied this country, conquering and ultimately absorbing them.

The second great group of peoples and languages are the Semitic, who are called after their supposed ancestor Shem, the son of Noah. They embrace the Hebrews, the Arabians, and other branches of the same stock. The languages of these peoples are essentially different from those of the other groups. The most perfect of these languages is the Hebrew as found in the Old Testament Scriptures. There are some affinities between these languages and those of the other groups, and further investigations may lead to greater correspondencies. Branches of this Semitic group are found in the tablets and cylinders of Babylon and Nineveh, recently brought to light by excavations, written in the cuneiform character. The Hebrew language, which stands at the head of this group, is now, and long has been, a dead language, but it continues to be used in the synagogue service of the Jews. The discussion of this question has no particular connection with the subject-matter of this book, and therefore we pass on without any further remarks.

The third group of nations and languages was formerly called the Indo-European, because it included those of India and Europe.

It is now designated the Aryan. This group includes the ancient race of Persia ; the race that migrated to India, and conquered the aborigines now represented by the Dravidic peoples. This race is now represented by the various peoples of India descended from them. The aborigines of India, like those of other countries, were driven to the hills and to the extremities of the country. The languages of modern India have come from the ancient Sanscrit language, now a dead language, like the Latin of Europe, but used by the priests of the Hindoos. The races of Europe have come from the same primitive stock as those of India, with the exceptions previously mentioned, the Hungarians, the Finns, the Lapps, and the Basques. This Aryan race, in their progress from their primitive home, took the direction east and west. A portion migrated through Persia into India, and formed the ancestors of the peoples of modern India, with the exception of the aborigines already mentioned. Another portion of this Aryan race migrated westward, and became the progenitors of the races now constituting Europe, except the aborigines.

It is generally maintained that the vanguard of this migrating Aryan race was the Celtic people, who have left their marks on the route from the East to the extreme West. In very ancient prehistoric times, the Celts were the dominant people of Europe. They were followed in successive waves by the Greeks and Romans ; by the Teutonic race, broken up in the course of time into the two classes of Germans and Scandinavians ; and, finally, by the Sclavonic race. These peoples, originally the same in race and language, pushed each other forward, until they settled in the countries they now occupy. In the course of time, living apart from each other, and under different climatic and geographic conditions, they underwent modifications of appearance, and in language, until they became different nations, and speaking different languages, thus becoming Gauls, Britons, French, Germans, Greeks, and Romans. The same Aryan nature, however, has remained, and the different languages which they speak are found to be but modifications of the one primitive Aryan speech. The roots of all these Indian and European languages are found to be the same.

In former times there was an earnest discussion as to the original speech of man, and the language of Paradise spoken by Adam and Eve. The Jews, of course, maintained that Hebrew was the primitive speech of man, and that spoken in Paradise. Welshmen, in seriousness or in joke, contended that Welsh, or the original Celtic speech, was the language of Paradise. The idea seemed not to have been entertained that modern languages are modifications of an older or primitive stock, and that no living tongue was or could be the primitive language of man. The result of modern investigation is a very close approximation to the Biblical doctrine of one primitive original language. All languages hitherto examined have been reduced to three groups, descended from three primitive stems. Further examination may possibly

show, on natural and scientific grounds, that all human tongues—Turanian, Semitic, and Aryan—have had a common origin. Some half-century ago the prevalent opinion among scientists was that languages were invented arbitrarily by different peoples in different situations. The definite and certain conclusion of modern study in the science of comparative languages is that the various languages of the world now recognised were *never manufactured*, or created, but are modifications of the primitive stem, or stems, to which they can be traced. The Welsh words which seem to be like those of other tongues contain the same roots as those found in the Sanscrit of India, the Greek and Roman, and the Teutonic speeches. In former times men imagined that they could trace other languages to their own, because of this common element. It is now proved that the Aryan languages of India and Europe have come from a common source, a mother tongue now lost in its primitive form, but found scattered in its offsprings, existing languages, which may be described as the dialects of the one original language, gradually modified in the course of time. Thus the Celtic language in its two branches, or the Welsh or Cymric branch, and the Irish or Gadhelic, contains the same roots as are found in the Sanscrit and the Aryan languages of Europe.

These general remarks are made as introductory to what follows on the Celtic people and language of Britain.

At the time when Britain came under the notice of the Romans, about two thousand years ago, the Celts were the dominant race in the country. They came originally from Gaul, and spoke the same language as the Gauls. They found in this country another race, who were the aborigines and belonged to the great group called the Turanians, whom they conquered, and ultimately absorbed. According to Tacitus, the Silurian tribes, who occupied the district now called Monmouthshire, and adjoining parts, belonged to a different race from the dominant Celts, and were allied to the Iberians of Spain.[1] This same race occupied, in Cæsar's time, a large part of Gaul called Aquitania, on the western coast. They were probably the aboriginal race of Europe, and were non-Aryan and Turanian. They were a small and dark people, but the Celts were a fair and taller race. Cæsar also, more than a century before Tacitus, states that the interior of Britain was occupied by a people who were considered indigenous to the soil; and the sea-coast by another race which had crossed over from Gaul and carried with them the names of their tribes. The two descriptions indicate that, in the judgment of these ancient writers, there were in Britain, some two thousand years ago, two races—the one the primitive inhabitants whom Tacitus called Iberians, a branch of the Turanian stock, then numerous in that part of Spain called Iberia; the other the Celts, belonging to the same race as the Gauls from whom they migrated to Britain.

The more precise inquiry of modern times into the races and languages of mankind has led to the conclusion that the definite

[1] See Tacitus, Life of Agricola, c. 11.

statement of Tacitus in the first century of our era was founded in truth. It is now maintained firmly that the aborigines of Britain were of the same race as the Iberians of Spain and the inhabitants of Aquitania in Gaul, and that they were non-Aryans, or Turanians. The Silurians mentioned in history were the most conspicuous remnants of this race. The Celts were the people who crossed over from Gaul and conquered the aborigines, and drove them into the interior of the country and to the west. There is no history of this conquest, and we have to rely upon considerations of a general nature, but trustworthy. The existence of the two types of races is even now apparent among the Welsh people. The small and dark people representing the Iberic race are numerous in Wales; and the light and fair-complexioned Celts are, of course, conspicuous. In modern times pure, unmixed races are not as common as in ancient times. The two races of Britain, the Iberic and the Celtic, became amalgamated gradually, and ultimately formed one people; but the marks of the original races are visible in their descendants, the present Welsh people. The ancient British Celtic people did to the aborigines the same thing that the Anglo-Saxons did to them—conquered and largely displaced them. The chief difference probably is that, amidst the fluctuations of time, the Welsh have maintained themselves as a separate people, still speaking the same Celtic language. The British Iberians, however, have disappeared as a distinct people, and are for ever absorbed in the Celtic population, showing their ancient features in the small and dark people still found among the Welsh population.

The Celts came to Britain from Gaul, not in one company and precisely at one time; they migrated in different companies, and at different times, according to circumstances. This migration seems to have come to an end at the time of the Roman invasion, and the Celts were in full possession of the country. There were many tribes among them before and after their settlement in Britain. They came, however, in two branches, whose distinctions have remained to the present day. These two branches were formed at a very early period, and existed apparently in their progress across Europe, following one another in their migration. These branches were the Gaelic, or Gadhelic, and the Cymric. The two are designated by recent writers, Goidels and Brythons. The former is represented in modern times by the Erse or Irish, the Gaels of Western Scotland or the Highlanders, and the Manx or inhabitants of the Isle of Man. The second branch, or the Cymric, or Brythonic, is now represented by the Welsh of Wales, by the people of Armorica, of Brittany in France, and in a qualified sense by the Celtic people of Cornwall, who up to the eighteenth century continued to speak a dialect of the Cymric language.

The first branch of the Celtic race that crossed over from Gaul and occupied this country were the Gaels, or the Goidels. They formed, indeed, the vanguard of the race in their pilgrimage from

the East to the West along the entire route through Europe. They were followed by the Cymric, or Brythonic, branch, pressing their brethren onward in the westerly direction. The Goidels were the inhabitants of the westerly part of Gaul at a very early period, driven there by the Brythons, who became the dominant people of Gaul. From Gaul the Goidels crossed over to Britain, and, after conquering the Iberic aborigines, and driving them to the west, settled down as the fixed inhabitants of the country. Then followed them the second branch of the race, the Brythons, and in course of time conquered the Goidels, and drove them to the west, and ultimately to Ireland. These changes took place in prehistoric times, before precise history began to be written. Thus, in successive times, the Iberians peopled this country, then the Goidelic branch of the Celts conquered them, and ultimately, along with the Cymry, formed the people known to the Romans as the Celtic Britons. The Brythons were the most powerful and important branch of the Celtic race, and they left their marks along the route of their journey through Europe to Gaul and to Britain. According to a recent historian, Professor Rhys, the Goidels left no mark of their existence on the continent of Europe. The Celtic marks in different parts of Europe are of the Cymric, or Brythonic, branch. The names of the chief rivers and mountains of Europe are of the Cymric, not of the Goidelic, branch. The Brythons were the Gauls who migrated from Gaul to Britain a long time subsequent to the immigration of the Goidels. They spoke the same Celtic form of speech as the Gauls, and differed very little from the Gaulish speech at the time of the Roman invasion, and for ages afterwards. In their progress they drove the Goidels westward, or scattered them in a westerly direction.

We must not, however, infer that the Brythons destroyed the Goidels, or drove all of them to Ireland, leaving none behind, thus securing a pure Brythonic race as the inhabitants of Britain, and subsequently of Wales. This was not the case. The Goidels continued to reside in Britain in large numbers. The language of the Goidels continued to be spoken, even in Wales, to the end of the seventh century. Ultimately the language and the people of the Gaelic, or Goidelic, Celts in Wales were absorbed by the Brythonic speech and people. The consequence of these changes is that the Welsh people of this generation, supposed by many to be purely Cymric, are the descendants of the ancient Goidels as well as the Brythons. They are, in fact, a mixed people, derived from three peoples—the ancient Iberians, who were non-Aryans, the Goidels, and the Brythons. The Cymric, or Welsh language, superseded the Iberic and the Goidelic or Irish languages, in Britain and Wales in ancient times. The Cymric, or Brythonic, people absorbed all the other peoples. Thus what on superficial observation appears a pure race, speaking one language, is a mixed people, inheriting the peculiarities of three peoples. The Goidels were numerous in South Wales, even when the Brythons were

predominant. They were so numerous in North Wales that they pressed hard the powerful Ordovices, who occupied a large portion of the country. The advance of the Brythons from the north under Cunedda and his sons led to the subjugation of the Goidels in North Wales.

Thus it appears that three races, or peoples, in ancient times successively invaded Britain, pressing each other westerly, conquering and subduing each other, and ultimately forming a mixed population, which became one in language and nationality. The question arises, when did these immigrations take place? It is impossible to answer the question definitely. The non-Aryan aborigines, which have been designated the Iberians, must have come into Britain at a very distant period in prehistoric times, probably two or three thousand years before the Christian era. Then followed, after a long interval, the vanguard of the Celts, the Goidels, or Gadhelic branch, which conquered the aborigines, and finally absorbed them. After another interval of some centuries the second branch of the Celts arrived, driving before them the Goidels and the Iberians to the interior of the country, and finally to the west, and to Ireland. It is impossible to fix any precise dates to these successive immigrations, but some recent historians have ventured to mention approximate dates. The able writer of the historical portion of the Blue Book—"The Land Question in Wales"—published in 1896, expresses the opinion that the Goidels, or the first Celtic settlers, came over from the Continent, and overran the southern part of Britain in the fifth or sixth century B.C., or perhaps earlier, and conquered the aborigines. Then, in the second or third century B.C., the Brythons came from Gaul, and gradually conquered the Goidels. In our judgment these dates do not give sufficient time for the settlement of these races such as we find them at the earliest period described by our oldest historical authorities. They may be taken, however, as approximate estimates.

The existence of the races described above, the Iberic and the two branches of the Celtic stock, at the early periods mentioned in the history of Britain seems now generally admitted by all competent scholars. The evidence may not be very full and precise, such as would be supplied for more modern questions, but it is as conclusive as could be reasonably expected relating to events that belong to prehistoric times, or to the dawn of history. There is, however, another source of information which contributes to confirm the conclusion indicated. It is the province of the antiquarian, which in modern times has yielded much information casting light on the condition and life of ancient peoples. Formerly there were many diverse opinions respecting the monuments in this country designated barrows, cromlechs, and circles. The name cromlech is of Celtic derivation, and has been applied to those stone monuments which consist of three upright stones and one flat resting on them. They enclose a chamber which originally contained certain remains. It has now been

proved that these cromlechs are barrows uncovered. In recent times, when mounds have been uncovered by antiquarians, they have been found to contain these stone monuments.

In former times men were of opinion that these cromlechs were ancient altars, Druidical altars, on which sacrifices, sometimes even human sacrifices, were offered. In those days many things were ascribed to the Druids which have since been otherwise explained. It is now certain that these peculiar stones were intended as the burial-places of certain individuals, and sometimes of families. There have been many mounds uncovered in modern times, and they have been found to contain the skeletons of human beings. Some of them have been discovered in a recumbent position, but others have been in a sitting posture. In the time of these last interments men were accustomed to sleep during the night in this posture, however strange it may seem to us, who associate rest and sleep with the lying posture. These sepulchral monuments are of different size and shape, some long and others round, some single and others double.

The other monuments, the circular form of stones, are generally designated Druidical Remains. They are found in different parts of the country. The most remarkable of these monuments are those known as Stonehenge and Avebury, in Wiltshire. Stonehenge is the most striking. The stones that compose it are, to some extent, now disarranged. Originally it consisted of an outer circle of thirty stones in an upright position, on which were placed many other stones in a horizontal position. The perpendicular stones were 7 ft. broad, 3 ft. in thickness, and 14 ft. high. The circle formed by these stones was about 100 ft. in diameter. Within this outer circle there was another circle 83 ft. in diameter, consisting also of thirty upright stones of smaller dimensions. Within this inner circle there were other stones arranged as groups of two triliths, two upright and one horizontal placed on the upright ones. These triliths were from 16 to 21 ft. in height. In front of each trilith were placed three smaller stones. In the centre of the whole was a large flat stone, which has been generally regarded as the altar.

There is evidently a great difference between these circular monuments and the cromlechs. In the judgment of most critics these erections were originally temples devoted to worship, probably according to the ancient ceremonies of the Druids. Around this Druidical temple at Stonehenge there are many cromlechs, probably the tombs of the Druidical priests who served at the temple.

The feature of the barrows and their contents which bear on the subject of this chapter—the different races among the ancient Britons—is the indication that they belonged to two different races of different ages. Some of the barrows are long, and others are round. The long barrows are found to contain the skeletons of a small race of men, low in stature, and having comparatively long heads. The round barrows contain the remains of men of larger

size, and having round heads. This is generally the case, but in some instances the two types of bodies have been found in the same tomb. The result of examination has shown that the long barrows are the most ancient, and belong to the stone age of human history, and that the round barrows, though old, are less ancient, and contain bronze materials, which belonged to an age subsequent to the stone age. The conclusion of antiquarians is that the skeletons contained in the long barrows belonged to the aboriginal race of this country, denominated the Iberians, or non-Aryans, and that the remains in the round barrows, being more recent, belonged to the Celtic race. The two races did to some extent live together after the Celtic conquest, and became mixed : hence individuals of both races may have been interred in some of the tombs that belonged to the Celtic period. This conclusion seems to point to the same result as the purely historical discussion, which proved the existence of a non-Aryan race as the aborigines of Britain long anterior to the coming of the Celts.

There are also other sepulchral monuments found in Britain. They have been called maenhirs, a Celtic word that means long-stones. These are found in some parts of Wales, and more in Ireland. They are considered to be not so ancient as the cromlechs. In times long subsequent to their erection the inhabitants placed inscriptions on these stones, at first in Latin, and afterwards in what have been called Ogham characters, a native invention. Several instances of these inscriptions have been found, about two dozen in Wales, but more than two hundred in Ireland. The language of these inscriptions is considered by critics to be the Goidelic, or the language of the Gaelic people. Such is a brief account of the races of ancient Britain.

CHAPTER III

THE TRIBES OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS

It seems to be a law in the development of nations that the earliest aggregations of men should assume the form of tribes and clans. The original source was probably the family, which by multiplication and branching formed the primitive clan, and, by the further expansion, the tribe, a collection of clans. This process seems to have been the natural and necessary course of early social and political life. Then tribes became united, and constituted the inhabitants of a large area, or smaller state, under the government of a chieftain or a king. These tribes, or aggregations of tribes, occupied in a country distinct and separate parts of the land, living near each other, in harmony sometimes, and often in antagonism and war. This was the primitive condition of the inhabitants of Europe who now constitute great states. In Greece, at the dawn of credible history, the Greek people formed small states, often at war with each other. This continued until the time of Alexander the Great, who conquered the small states and united them into one kingdom. The same thing existed in Italy, until the Romans became powerful, and conquered the other small states, and united them into one Roman state. The German people in ancient times were an aggregation of tribes, having a common race sympathy, but without any national unity. The people of Gaul consisted of many tribes, gradually forming larger states within the territory which went under the name of Gaul, comprehending modern France, Belgium, and Switzerland. Coming nearer home, we find that the people of Britain 2,000 years ago had formed themselves into a number of tribes, independent, or semi-independent, of each other. In Ireland the divisions into tribes and clans were even greater than in Britain.

The conception of national unity as understood in modern times did not exist, or was not realised. Great conquerors, such as Alexander and the Cæsars, subdued tribes and small states, and brought them under their military power and government ; but when the military conquerors passed away, generally the peoples fell back on their ancient subdivisions. This was generally the case among the peoples of Europe. The consequence was that in ancient times the majority were often conquered and oppressed by a minority who were united and better organised. The aggregation

of tribes who may have belonged to the same race and united by a common sentiment, but not organically united under a common ruler and government, could not stand against a people united in government and organisation. The result was that the tribes were commonly at war, and were at the mercy of powerful warriors who were at the head of a united people. Even in comparatively modern times, the national unity which is necessary to the strength, the independence, and the prosperity of a people has been imperfectly understood. Half a century ago Italy was only "a geographical expression," containing eight or ten small states under the dictation of the foreigner ; now she is a united kingdom possessing strength and prosperity. The same thing may be said of other states.

Such was the condition of Britain in ancient times. There can be no doubt that the Celtic Britons immigrated from Gaul some centuries before the Christian era. There is less knowledge of the course of migration pursued by the aborigines who preceded the Celts ; but the probability is that they also crossed the Channel from Gaul, as we find that the same race inhabitated Aquitania, a portion of Gaul, at the time of the Roman invasion. The inhabitants of Gaul 2,000 years ago were similar to those of Britain, a mixture of non-Aryan Iberians and the Celts. The language of Cæsar seems to convey this :—"Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres : quarum unam incolunt Belgæ, aliam Aquitani, tertiam qui ipsorum lingua Celtæ, nostra Galli adpellantur. Hi omnes lingua, institutis, legibus inter se differunt." This we render into English thus :—"The whole of Gaul is divided into three parts, of which one the Belgæ inhabit, another the Aquitani, the third are called in their own language Celts, in ours Gauls. All these differ among themselves in language, institutions, and laws." The Belgæ were, in all probability, as here stated, a branch of the Celtic race, and the Aquitani were the aborigines of the Iberic race. The Gauls were the same Celtic race, and their language differed from that of the Belgæ only dialectically. The language of Britain was essentially the same as that of the Gauls. The two peoples had no difficulty in understanding each other's speech.

Even in the fourth century, at the Council of Arles, A.D. 314, the British bishops and the Gauls had, as reported, no difficulty in understanding each other. The Gaulish language continued in use in Gaul or France until the seventh century, when it was gradually superseded by a dialect of Latin, now known as French. The south of Britain was the first to be occupied by the immigrant Gauls. The Belgic portion of the race at such early period crossed over and occupied the territory on the coast from the Isle of Wight to the east of England, and even to the Firth of Forth. These immigrants seemed to possess the most fertile portions of the country, and became the most prosperous. They were known by the Celts of the interior under the name of the Logrians, and the country as Logria. The Belgic tribes were

probably Brythons. Some writers have contended that they were Germans, but the almost universal opinion now is that they were Celts of the Brythonic branch; and probably, being pressed by another wave of immigrants from Germany, they crossed over to Britain in large numbers, and drove the Celtic inhabitants of the south, probably mostly Goidels, into the interior of the country. The two branches of the Celtic race now occupied the country, mixed in the same district, or in different tribes in separate provinces. The Brythons of the south gradually pressed the Goidels westward.

The number of tribes in Britain was very great, and can be described in this chapter only generally. Some of these tribes seem to have crossed over from Gaul entire or nearly so, and carried their names with them, being thus known in Gaul and in Britain under the same designations. We will commence our description in the south. We can indicate the relative positions of the ancient tribes approximately by the modern counties of England and Wales. The country of Cantium inhabited by the Cantii gave the name to the county of Kent. This district was in the time of Cæsar important, and was governed by four chiefs or kings. The Cantii were an influential tribe, and belonged to the Belgic Gauls, who crossed over the Channel and displaced the earlier inhabitants. In the south-west of Cantium the Regni occupied the territory corresponding to the counties of Sussex and Surrey. Proceeding westward, we find that the tribes designated the Belgæ formed the inhabitants of the large district now known as Hampshire, including the Isle of Wight, Wiltshire, and Somersetshire. The territory extending along the coast from the Belgæ was occupied by the tribes of the Durotriges, or the dwellers by the water, and coincided with Dorsetshire; the extensive country from the last-named district, stretching to the extreme west, was called Dumnonium, and the inhabitants the Dumnonii, and corresponded with Devonshire and Cornwall. If we now return to the point from which we started, Kent, we may proceed along the eastern and northern coast. The important tribe of the Trinobantes were the inhabitants of the greater part of Middlesex and Essex. Beyond these were the warlike tribe of the Iceni who occupied our Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and Huntingdon. They were the warlike tribes who under the Queen Boadicea rose against the Romans, and inflicted on them such losses. Beyond the Iceni were the Coritani, whose possessions extended from the mouth of the Humber through Lincolnshire to Derby, and comprehended the counties of Lincoln, Nottingham, Rutland, Northampton, Leicester, and Derby. Still following the coast we find the Parisii, occupying the south-eastern part of Yorkshire between the Tees and the Humber. This tribe, when they came over from Gaul, brought with them their name, the remains of which are found in the designation of the French capital Paris. Still proceeding along the eastern coast, we find the Otadini, whose territory extended from the Tyne to the Firth of Forth. Turning

round to the north-west we come to the territory of the Dumnonii, extending to the Clyde and embracing the hills between Galloway and Carrick. Continuing in the same north-western direction we find the Selgovæ, inhabiting Annandale and Eskdale in Dumfrieshire and part of Galloway. Next to them were the Novantes, occupying most of Galloway.

The preceding tribes were the most important who inhabited the districts on the coasts, extending also in some measure to the interior. In the main parts of the interior of Britain were several very powerful tribes. The Catuvelauni, an important tribe, occupied the territory now known as Buckingham, Bedford, and Hertford. The people called the Atrebates, who carried with them their name from Gaul, inhabited the county of Berkshire. The most powerful and numerous tribe in the interior were the Brigantes, who, with smaller and subordinate ones, extended through the country to the boundary of Scotland, as known by us, and embraced the counties of Lancaster, Westmorland, and Cumberland. The smaller tribes embraced in this greater tribe were the Voluntii of West Lancashire and the Sestuntii of Westmorland and Cumberland. The tribe of the Corenavii dwelt in the counties of Warwick, Worcester, Stafford, Shropshire, and Cheshire, between South Wales and the Brigantes. Proceeding westerly, we come to the region of the Dobuni, embracing the counties of Oxford and Gloucester.

The above were the chief tribes which occupied that part of Britain which we now call England, as distinguished from Wales and Scotland. In Scotland there were many distinct tribes. On the east coast were the Vernicomes ; farther north, still on the east coast, there were the Tæxali. Then, turning to the left, we find that the Vacomagi occupied the district now known as the counties of Banff, Elgin, Nairn, and part of Inverness, and Braemar, near Aberdeenshire. The warlike tribe of the Caledonians possessed the territory intervening between Inverness and Perth to the Balnagowan forest. The Cantæ, or Decantæ, occupied the eastern part of Ross. The Lugi, the Smertæ, and the Cornavii were farther north ; the Cerones, the west coast of Inverness and part of Argyleshire. The Epidii occupied Cantyre.

We now come to the tribes in the occupation of the country which we now call Wales, which 2,000 years ago formed the western part of Britain. The most important and powerful tribe that occupied what we now call North Wales were the Ordovices. They were, generally speaking, in the occupation of the district corresponding to the counties of Montgomery, Flint, Denby, part of Merioneth and Carnarvon, and some districts in England adjacent. This tribe probably belonged to the later Celtic immigrants and formed a part of the Cymric, or, more correctly, the Brythonic branch of the Celtic race. According to Professor Rhys (" Celtic Britain," pp. 86, 87) the inhabitants of the north-west corner of North Wales, within the basins of the Clwyd and the Mawddach and the Isle of Mona, or Anglesea, were of the

early Celtic settlers, and belonged to the Goidelic branch of the race. It is, of course, certain that the vanguard of the Celtic immigrants from Gaul to Britain were of the Goidelic or Gadhelic branch, and that gradually the Brythons, who came later, drove the Goidels westward and finally to Ireland. Many of them, however, remained in Britain, and were ultimately absorbed by the Brythons. The two branches of the race, however, united in resisting the progress of the Romans. In the most recent maps, those in Rhys' "Celtic Britain" and in the Blue Book of 1896, the districts of North Wales referred to, including much of Carnarvon and Flint, besides Anglesea, are marked as Goidelic, but to the exclusion of the Ordovices who pressed them westward.

If we proceed along the coast into South Wales, we come into the ancient country of the Demetæ, including Cardiganshire, Carmarthenshire, and Pembrokeshire. These Demetæ are now considered by the best critics as belonging to the early settlers of the Goidelic race, pushed onward by the advancing Brythons. The other great division of South Wales, the eastern portion, was occupied by the warlike tribes of the Silures. Their country embraced the counties of Glamorgan, Brecon, Radnor, Monmouth, and Hereford. The modern geologist, Sir R. Murchison, has given to the ancient geological strata that come between the Cambrian and the old red sandstone the name of the Silurian, because they are most commonly found as the most prominent rocks of the district occupied by the ancient Silurian tribes. These tribes were very warlike and offered the greatest opposition to the Romans. In the opinion of the most learned critics the Silures were a branch of the aborigines, and were a non-Aryan race.

The above is a general enumeration and description of the most important tribes of Britain in the first century of our era. There were other smaller tribes subordinate to the greater, or independent of them, which we have not specially mentioned. The total number of the tribes was considerable. For the information concerning them we are indebted to Roman and Greek writers, and especially to the distinguished astronomer and geographer Ptolemy—Claudius Ptolemæus—who lived in Egypt in the first part of the second century. He wrote his book, giving a survey of the world as then known, about A.D. 120, and he described therein the geography of Britain and the numerous tribes who constituted its inhabitants. These tribes were generally independent of each other, but in certain emergencies they appointed one of their kings or chiefs as their head and leader and commander in war. The union thus effected was never very complete, and this was a cause of their weakness and want of success. Tacitus, in his Life of Agricola, makes the following observation on this want of unity :—"The Britons were formerly governed by kings, but at present they are divided in factions and parties among their chiefs ; and this want of union for concerting some general plan is the most favourable circumstance to us in our designs against so

powerful a people. It is seldom that two or three communities concur in repelling the common danger, and thus, while they engage singly, they are all subdued." This was the common source of British weakness—the want of national organic unity, arising from the existence of numerous tribes connected by no strong tie of organic oneness. If they had been a well-compacted people, under one supreme central authority, they would not, in all probability, have been defeated by the Romans. They had numbers, courage, and skill, but no organised government for the whole country. Government by tribes or provincial states have never succeeded against a united and well-organised power. The same remark applies to the contest between the Britons and the Anglo-Saxons.

It is evident, from preceding observations and facts, that the numerous tribes of the ancient Britons included more races than one, speaking different languages. The Silures were tribes that belonged to the aborigines, who were non-Aryans, and spoke a language essentially different from that of the Celts—a language which was similar to that of the Iberians of Spain, probably a dialect of the same. When this language ceased to be spoken by the Britons we cannot say. In course of time the people were absorbed by the Celts, and their language disappeared. The first branch of the Celts were the Gaels, or Goidels, and they probably conquered the aborigines. These continued for many ages, and constituted the tribes that occupied Anglesea and the extreme portions of North Wales. The greater part of Demetia, in South Wales, was also possessed by them in the early ages of our era. The Goidelic, or Gaelic, language, continued to be spoken in Britain until the seventh century. The Cymric, or Brythonic people ultimately triumphed, and became the predominant people, and their language the only one spoken from the seventh century amongst the mixed population of Wales.

Many Welshmen seem to think that the present generation of Welshmen now living in Wales and elsewhere have descended as a pure race from the ancient Cymry. They speak of the English, or the Saxons, as a very mixed race, which undoubtedly they are ; but imagine that the Welsh are comparatively an unmixed race. This is, however, imagination. They are descended from three ancient peoples—the Iberians, the Goidels, or Gaels ; and the Cymry, or the Brythons. According to some recent writers, such as Professor Rhys, of Oxford, the Cymric element is the smallest of the three, and that probably the non-Aryan element—the Iberic—is the largest, represented by the small, dark people among modern Welshmen. There is one striking fact, however, connected with this matter. The Brythonic, or Cymric, language has survived to the present in its purity. The first language spoken in Britain was the Iberic, then the Goidelic, and finally the Cymric, or modern Welsh. The Goidels conquered the Iberians, and gradually absorbed them and their language ; the Brythons conquered the Goidels, and gradually absorbed them, and their language dis-

appeared in the seventh century. The Iberians are entirely lost as a race, but the Goidels survive in Ireland and the Highlands of Scotland as a distinct people, and speaking to some extent the Goidelic language, a dialect of the same ancient Celtic tongue of which the Welsh is another. Such seem to be the conclusions of modern scholars respecting the ancestors of Welshmen.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHARACTER OF THE COUNTRY

The material condition of a country depends upon many causes. The latitude, or situation, the climate, the inherent nature of the soil ; the number, intelligence, and industry of the inhabitants, and the character of the government, are some of the most important causes that operate to the prosperity or adversity of any and every land. It is obvious that a country situated in a part of the earth where the climate is very severe cannot become as productive and prosperous as one in a warm or temperate clime. Many articles of food and clothing can be produced only under the conditions of a bright sun, a genial climate, and sufficient moisture.

And unless the inherent nature of the soil be good, no amount of cultivation can be very successful in the production of abundant crops. Mere hard rocks may yield minerals of great value to a civilised people, but cannot produce corn and other necessary articles of food for man and animals. The character of the inhabitants is a most important cause in the creation of material prosperity. There are now countries on the earth known to possess fertile plains, a genial climate, and the best of soils, capable of producing the best and the most abundant fruits, which would enrich the population and secure prosperity ; and yet they are not prosperous, and the natural resources are not developed. The inhabitants have been deficient in intelligence, and in industrial habits. There are other lands where the natural resources have been small and poor, but the population have been intelligent, self-reliant, and industrious, and they have become prosperous by the skilful development of what resources there were. In Europe, Switzerland is a fine example of this. The natural resources are only moderate, but by intelligent industry the country has become fertile and prosperous. A people who are ignorant and superstitious, and take life too easy, will never become strong, rich, and prosperous. Much, of course, depends on the government of a country. A government that is tyrannical prevents the development of the country by injuriously meddling with every kind of human activity. The idea of liberty is that which implies the abstinence of governmental interference with the legitimate activity of the people in the development of their resources, and the

pursuit of happiness. Every barbarous and uncivilised government is repressive, and hinders the advancement of the country.

These remarks have an application to the condition and progress of the ancient Britons. The climate of the country two thousand years ago was substantially the same as now. Some change has been made in this respect by the cultivation of the soil and the large clearance of the timber that once covered the greater part of the land. The inherent nature of the soil is the same, but the ancient inhabitants did not know what that soil contained as we know. The people of this country are changed ; even those of Wales have made immense progress, and the government is different—changed from the arbitrary control of tribal governments to that of a free and constitutional government, securing personal freedom.

The rocks which make our hills and mountains contain specimens of nearly all the geological strata of the earth. From the ancient Cambrian, and even pre-Cambrian rocks, up to the tertiary, and most modern deposits, specimens in abundance are found. The Silurian strata, which succeeded the Cambrian in the order of time, are abundant, especially in Wales ; and the name Silurian given to them was derived from the name of the tribes which occupied the district where these rocks are most prominent. The old red sandstone is very conspicuous in Britain, and then follows the carboniferous group that has so long been the source of our coal, which has contributed largely to the prosperity of modern Britain, and enabled the inhabitants to turn ironstone into iron and steel. The new red sandstone, which follows the carboniferous, contains the salt beds which have been the cause of immense benefit to the country from ancient to modern times. These treasures of the rocks were not understood by the ancient Britons, and were gradually discovered in the progress of intelligence and science. From the rocks the soils of our country have finally been derived by the gradual wearing of their surfaces.

There were two important industries among the ancient Britons which had their origin in the mineral rocks of the country. The first and best known was the tin trade. This trade was carried on by the Phœnicians with Britain for many centuries before the Christian era, some say 1100 B.C. It is certain that the trade was carried on a long time before this era. Cornwall and the Scilly Islands were the parts of Britain where the tin stone was obtainable. The trade was prosperous during and before the Roman occupation, but declined in the times of the Anglo-Saxons, and revived again under the Normans. In ancient times tin was known only in Britain, but since then it has been discovered in many other countries, consequently the trade is more general, and in Britain has declined through the partial exhaustion of the Cornish mines. The second trade carried on by the ancient Britons was that in iron, in the Forest of Dean, and in the district of Kent and Sussex iron mining and smelting was carried on before the time of the Romans and during their occupation. The trade continued for many centuries. It is not probable that the trade was

of great dimensions. The vast resources of iron ore which Britain possessed in her rocks were not known to the natives or to the Romans. It appears from the investigations of antiquarians, especially Professor Boyd Dawkins, that the iron industry of the south of England continued up to the nineteenth century, and the last forge was blown out so late as 1825, though the trade had gradually been declining from the sixteenth century, owing to the scarcity of fuel. The trade naturally was transferred to those districts where coal abounded, the North of England and South Wales.

When the Romans first came to Britain a large part of the country was covered with woods and forests. This is generally the condition of any country whose inhabitants are comparatively few, and only partially civilised, and where the cultivation of the land is neglected. Although Cæsar considered that the inhabitants of Britain were numerous, the estimate must be regarded as rough, and according to the standard of the time. Compared with the size of the country the population was probably small. The land was only partially cultivated. The forests were not only numerous, but extensive. The forest called Andredsweald, in Latin Anderida, extended from the Downs in Hampshire to the Medway, 120 miles long and 30 miles broad. The district now known as the Weald in Kent and Sussex is the remains of this vast forest. Another forest extended from Hampshire, through Dorsetshire, along the Wiltshire downs to the valley of the Frome. The New Forest of modern times is the fragmentary remains of this forest. The Forest of Dean, in Gloucestershire, was in ancient times much more extended than now, though even yet it is a considerable forest, where coal and iron still continue to be obtained. Some little distance beyond Worcester there commenced a vast forest which reached as far as Cheshire in the north-west, and bore the name of the Forest of Wyre. The modern county of Warwickshire was largely covered by the Forest of Arden. The forests of Sherwood and Needwood extended through Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, between the Peak and the Trent. The moorlands of Pickering, and a desert that extended from Derbyshire to the Roman wall, included the vale of York. Beyond the wall was the extensive woodland represented by the Forest of Selkirk.

In these forests the wolf, the wild boar, and wild oxen roamed and flourished, and continued to do so for many ages. Gradually, however, the forests were cleared, and the names of places even now indicate the origin of the settlements. The *fields* were the ancient clearings of parts of the forests, and turned into villages in the forest ; the *dens* were the deep wooded valleys ; the *leys* were the open forest glades for the feeding and rearing of cattle. The British word *gwent*, Latin *venta*, denoted a large open clearing, and formed the ancient fertile valleys and the cultivated uplands. The word was applied in ancient times to many districts. The town of Winchester, or Gwentceaster, is a modern reminder

that in ancient British and Roman times the district in Hampshire which now comprehends the Downs was a gwent, or large clearing, and made by the Britons, and afterwards occupied by the Romans as a camp, hence the name, made up of British *gwent* and Latin *castra*. This was originally the Gwenta or Venta Belgarum. In the eastern part, now called the Eastern Counties, Norfolk and Suffolk, there was a large gwent situated in the country occupied by the Iceni, the kingdom of Boadicea, the Venta Icenorum of the Romans. A still more important gwent was situated in Monmouthshire and Glamorganshire, in the country occupied by the ancient Silures, and called after them the Venta Silurum. Even now the name is retained in Monmouthshire, and is recognised in the newspaper published in Newport called *The Star of Gwent*. These gwents were very large clearings or openings made in the large ancient forests, and converted into fertile plains and uplands. The wolds of Lincolnshire and Yorkshire and the Cotswold of Gloucestershire indicate the same ancient process of turning woods and forests into cultivated lands. The process began in very olden times, and the names were modified afterwards by Romans and Saxons. The name Cotswold, for instance, is derived from the British or Welsh *coed* (wood), and the Saxon *wold* (wood), an addition made by the Saxons. The Romans did much to promote the cultivation of the land, but even in their time the greater part of the country was covered by forests, and large tracts were wastes and fens. The fens of Lincolnshire, now so fertile, were anciently mere swamps, and the Wash of the same country covered large districts now turned into fertile fields. The Romney Marsh in olden times was what the name implies—a mud flat overflowed by the tide—though it now comprehends 50,000 acres of the most fertile land. The word Romney *marsh* comes from the Celtic word *riumne*, meaning the same as the modern word marsh. The fertile river valleys, which are now the home of agricultural industry, were in old British times covered with thick scrub.

The inhabitants of ancient Britain lived by agriculture. There were no manufactures in the modern sense of the term. The tin trade was the only one that formed their commerce, as previously described. There was some internal trade in iron. According to Cæsar's account, there was bronze in the country, but it was imported. In the early period of the Roman occupation there were some coins in circulation bearing British inscriptions. There were in the south of Britain some coins bearing the names of Commios and his three sons. In the country of the Dobuni or Boduni, embracing Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire, there were coins independent of the inhabitants of the south, probably in the early part of the first century, the form of which indicated a foreign or Greek origin, a rough imitation of the Greek stater.

The great traveller, Pythias, came to Britain about the year 330 B.C., and visited many parts of the island, and sailed along the coast to the north. He visited the country twice, and saw more

of it than any other ancient visitor. In the course of his travels he noticed the condition of the country, and especially its agriculture. The book containing the history of his travels has been lost, but portions of it have been preserved in the works of some ancient authors. He visited especially the south-east, and there he saw much corn in the fields, and observed that the farmers gathered the sheaves into large barns where the threshing was done. He remarked that, owing to the absence of much sun and presence of much rain and many clouds, the threshing could not be done in the open air, as in countries of brighter sun and more genial climate. He also remarked that further north corn could not be grown. The country, he observed, consisted mostly of forest and marsh, but there were open spaces cleared in the forests for the cattle and the sheep where they were kept and fed. Another traveller, a Greek, who came to Britain two hundred years later, was Posidonius, whose testimony has been preserved by Diodorus Siculus. According to him, the harvest consisted of cutting the ears of the corn off, and storing them in the ground, and taking them therefrom daily and prepared for food, the oldest taken first. This testimony was different from that of Pythias given above. Probably they applied to different portions of the country, where customs differed in varied climes and among different tribes.

Cæsar, in his work De Bello Gallico, describes his visits to Britain, and states that the maritime districts were corn countries, that the Belgic settlers introduced agriculture, and that the wild settlers of the interior did not cultivate the land, but lived on milk and flesh, and that cattle were abundant. The testimony of Tacitus in his Life of Agricola is not precisely the same as Cæsar's. According to him, the soil, though unfit for the olive, the vine, and other productions of warmer climates, is fertile, and suitable for corn.

We must accept the statements of these writers with a qualification. Their observations were limited to small portions of the country, and what was true of one part was not of another. We know that even now some districts of England are more suitable for the production of corn than others. Some of their declarations were probably founded on the imperfect testimony of others, and not reliable as to the condition of the entire country. It is quite certain that Britain, as a whole, was a corn producer as well as a rearer of cattle and sheep.

The prehistoric villages that have been uncovered in recent times by General Pitt Rivers and others have disclosed samples of wheat equal to what is cultivated in the present day. The ancient Britons were undoubtedly skilful cultivators of the soil. The population of the south-east of Britain were more numerous and more advanced than those in the interior, and their cultivation of the corn was more extensive and skilful, as indicated by their erection of spacious barns for preserving it. In the interior the inhabitants were more sparse, and corn was less cultivated ; but there is reason to believe that corn was cultivated through the country, more or less, according to the nature of the soil.

Strabo, the geographer, and Diodorus Siculus have given some accounts of the agriculture of the Britons which Cæsar had omitted. They were said to live on milk and flesh, but they were not acquainted with the art of making cheese, and they were strangers to gardening and other methods of agriculture. These statements must not be accepted absolutely ; they were partly founded on careless reports at second-hand, and applied probably only to some parts of the country. The British or Welsh word for cheese was in use, namely *caws*, and has been continued to the present time. Tacitus, in his Life of Agricola, makes the statement that the soil of Britain was fertile and suitable for corn. Growth was quick, but maturation slow, owing to the humidity of the ground and the atmosphere—a description that would fit the country in this age. The dogs of Britain were numerous, and were strong and fierce, and were bred for the chase, and used by the Gauls in some warlike operations.

There was one article of drink, well known in modern times under the name of ale or beer, which the ancient Britons made from wheat and honey, or the mead still known in some parts of Wales. The Welsh name of this drink is *cwrw*, the same then and now. It is remarkable how alcoholic drinks have been used by the nations and tribes of mankind from prehistoric to modern times.

CHAPTER V

THE CHARACTER OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS

WHAT sort of people were the ancient Britons in their appearance, and their manner and mode of life? The question can be answered only by careful discrimination, and then imperfectly. That they were not barbarians, nor semi-barbarians, is quite certain. They were not among the most advanced of races, such as the Greeks and Romans; but, like their kinsfolk, the Gauls, they were for the time a courageous, intelligent, industrious, and orderly people. The descriptions given of them by ancient writers and by some English historians must be taken with a qualification. According to Cæsar, who saw very little of them, the Britons stained themselves with a blue dye made from woad, to give them a more terrible appearance in battle; and they wore their hair long, and shaved every part of the body but the head and the upper lip. They also were said to clothe themselves with skins. This description applied to the tribes of the interior, who were described as wild and uncultivated in contrast with the maritime people of Cantium and the south, who were descended from the Belgic settlers, who were more civilised, and resembled the Gauls. Cæsar and Tacitus regarded the inhabitants of the southern coast as more civilised than the tribes of the interior, and more like the Gauls in manners and even in language. The painting of the body, or of the face only, probably did prevail among some of the wilder tribes; but this practice was not peculiar to the Britons, but prevailed among other peoples, as indicated by some ancient authors. The shaving of the face, except the upper lip, would make them have an appearance similar to the modern European who cultivates the moustache. The practice was designed to increase their ferocity in war.

The inhabitants of the interior probably contained in large part the most ancient tribes, who came over in prehistoric times from Gaul. They consisted of the aborigines of the Iberic race, and the oldest branch of the Celtic race—the Goidels. The latest immigrants were of the Brythonic or Cymric branch of the Celts, and were the most advanced in civilisation. These gradually drove the earlier settlers into the interior. It is probable that some of these interior tribes were the people who were intended

to be described in the ancient writings quoted above. The Brythons, however, were superior to the tribes referred to.

The houses which the ancient Britons occupied were not, of course, of a superior character, and had no pretension to fine architecture, as was the case among the Greeks and the Romans. They had plenty of timber of the same kind as existed in Gaul, except the fir and the beech. This was the testimony of Cæsar. According to some descriptions, the houses were only temporary erections, made of wood, or mere huts of reeds, situated in enclosed spaces in the forests, and, after a time, pulled down and removed to other similar positions suitable for their cattle and sheep. These houses were similar to those in Gaul. This description applied to some of the tribes in the interior, who wandered from place to place according to circumstances, but it was not applicable to the whole country. There were in those times no large or important towns in Britain. There were villages or settlements for families belonging to a tribe, which afterwards became the sites of towns under Roman power. The houses described were the kind of residences which existed in many other countries under similar circumstances, and for many ages afterwards. Those of the south of Britain were probably of a better kind, and more permanent than those belonging to the interior tribes, who lived mostly in the cleared enclosures of the forests.

The Britons of those early times were not unacquainted with the sea. The tribes of the Gauls named the Veneti, who inhabited the part of Gaul opposite the British coast, were skilful in their construction of ships, and they carried on a considerable maritime trade with Britain. Professor Rhys, in his "Celtic Britain," makes the following observation :—"Up to their unsuccessful contest with Cæsar in B.C. 56, the Veneti not only carried on most of the trade with Britain, or levied a tax on all others who took part in it, but they counted among their allies all the maritime tribes from the Loire to the country of the Morini and Menapii, and they obtained help also from Britain, whence it may be gathered, as they mainly relied on what they could do at sea, that the ships of all the members of this Armoric or maritime league were much of the same make, whether in Gaul or in Britain ; and some idea of their number may be formed from the fact that the Veneti managed to get together on their own coast, south of Brittany, about 220 vessels fully manned to oppose Cæsar's fleet as soon as it sailed out of the Loire."

These Veneti were connected with the Britons, and were on friendly terms with them, and traded with them in tin and bronze, and afterwards in pottery, salt, and other articles. The writer goes on to show that the art of shipbuilding, learnt from the Carthaginians of Spain, was not lost on the shores of Gaul and Britain by the Roman conquest under Cæsar, and that our marine of the present day has derived its descent through the Veneti from the Carthaginians and the proud merchants of Tyre and Sidon. The inhabitants of the south-east coast of Britain, largely of the

Brythonic branch of the Celts, became acquainted with commerce through their long connection and friendship with the Veneti of Armorica. In the earliest times they were thus familiar with trade and commerce, though on a small scale.

They were also acquainted with the business of fishing, not merely on the sea, but also, and mainly, on the rivers of the interior. For this purpose, as well as for pleasure, they used boats—canoes formed from trunks of trees, and small boats made of skin, which could be carried on the owner's back, from place to place, by which he could cross a river or engage in fishing. This small boat is known under the name of the *coracle*, Welsh, *cwrwgvl*. This specimen of an ancient British boat may sometimes be seen on a Welsh river in this age.

That the ancient Britons were brave and heroic in battle was admitted by Cæsar and also by Tacitus. The latter, in his Life of Agricola, states that the Britons were brave and more ferocious in war than the Gauls. The British armies consisted of infantry, who formed the greater part, as even in modern armies. There were also cavalry, which were supplied by some tribes, according to the testimony of Tacitus. There were also chariots, which served an important purpose in war. In each of these chariots the chief officer guided the reins, standing in the centre, and the men occupied the sides of the machine, using their instruments of war against their enemy. Their instruments of war were not to be compared with those of the Romans. They were swords, spears, bows and arrows, clubs, axes, and light targets. The Britons were skilful in the use of their weapons, and were not deficient in war-like tactics. There was one thing in which they were wanting—genuine national unity.

The government of the country changed from time to time, as in other countries. According to Tacitus, before his time the Britons were under the government of kings, as indicated in the passage quoted above. These kings were not rulers over the whole of Britain, but only over large portions, or provinces. During that period the people were more powerful and successful than they were in the time of Tacitus. The breaking up of the people into smaller tribes and governments led to confusion, weakness, and disaster. These tribal governments were frequently at war with each other. We have no detailed history of those tribal wars, but only the general statement that they did occur. From very early prehistoric times we have reason to believe the wars were carried on. After these ancient conquests the inhabitants settled down in tribes and clans under the government of their chiefs—a government which was, of course, autocratic. And from time to time these tribal communities quarrelled and fought and made themselves the prey to enemies stronger than themselves coming from abroad.

There is one feature of the social life of the ancient Britons which has been mentioned against them in Roman and English histories. Cæsar is the authority, and his words are: "Ten or

twelve men have their wives in common ; brothers very commonly with brothers, and parents with children. The offspring of such wife is reckoned to belong to the husband who first married her." Even this statement has been perverted by some modern writers to the effect that several brothers, or a father and his sons, had only one wife between them. This charge against the ancient Britons is astounding, and almost incredible. Amongst the most degraded peoples there always is much jealousy and sensitiveness in relation to women ; and it can hardly be imagined that any number of men could be inclined to live in social life like dogs or other animals. The statement rests upon the authority of Cæsar only, and was not repeated by his successors, not even by Tacitus. Cæsar's observations were limited to a small portion of the Britons, and only for a short period. He depended largely on hearsay evidence. The gossip of the most advanced people residing on the coast, whom he mostly saw, magnified the vices and defects of the interior tribes, and even these exaggerations were misunderstood by him. The statement of Cæsar is inconsistent with all that we know of the ancient Britons from other sources. In the ancient laws of Wales, which have come down to us from remote antiquity, there is no indication of any such custom.

The institution of marriage on the basis of one woman to one man is clearly declared and provided for. The woman is given in marriage by her kindred with a suitable dowry, in Welsh gwaddol, and her marital rights are duly guarded ; and this was to be under the sanction and by the consent of the lord. There is another kind of marriage recognised, where the woman could give herself away to her husband. In all these laws there is a clear distinction between marriage and illicit intercourse, between legitimacy and illegitimacy, and no recognition of anything approaching to polyandria or polygamy. To this it may be objected that the laws referred to were enacted many centuries after the time of Julius Cæsar, and therefore do not properly apply to the question. We may, however, remark that the ancient laws of Wales here referred to were not *enacted* centuries after the time mentioned. They were reduced to *writing* in a precise and orderly manner in the tenth century by or under the authority of Howel Dda, or the Good ; but they existed as the legal customs of the people from time immemorial, even from prehistoric times. On this point we venture to quote the following from the able historian Green in his work, "The Making of England," page 13 :—"The Welsh laws which we possess, in a later shape, are undoubtedly in the main the same system of early customs which Rome found existing in the days of Claudius and Cæsar ; and the fact that they remained a living law when her legions withdrew proves their continuance throughout the four hundred years of her rule, as it proves the practical isolation from Roman life and Roman civilisation of the native communities which preserved them." (See also Maine's "Early History of Institutions.")

In all probability Cæsar misunderstood and misrepresented the social and family life of the ancient Britons. We know that the Celtic settlements previously described were founded on the family as the unit. As the family increased, and by the introduction of fresh women from outside, who married the men of the family, and were incorporated into that family, new branches were formed, or rather new families were formed, and maintained on the original estate, until they constituted a kindred of several families residing on the undivided estate, which could not be re-divided for at least three generations. All these families, as a common kindred, resided in one settlement and formed a British village. Cæsar probably was misled to imagine that the families of this kindred in one small village in a forest clearing had common intercourse. The story was a blunder from the beginning, and may be dismissed from the true history of the ancient Britons.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS—DRUIDISM

It is now a well-established truth that there is no nation or tribe of mankind entirely destitute of religion. The type may be very low, and even degraded, and yet it clearly indicates the existence of religious thought and feeling. It may sometimes be difficult to detect its existence in the rough exterior and shy manner of barbarous life, but there it is, notwithstanding. Some travellers and writers have mentioned tribes in whom no evidence of anything religious could be discovered, such as the most degraded of South America, or Africa, and the aborigines of Australia and the South Seas ; but more careful examination has discovered that they had a belief in the Supreme Being, in the soul, and in the future. In doubting the religious possessions of these tribes, critics have taken the high standard of religious conceptions in Europe, and, having failed to observe the manifestation of these, they have come to the hasty conclusion that barbarous tribes have no religion. Close examination and patient observation have led to the discovery that the most unspiritual barbarians have a name for the Invisible Spirit, the Creator of the world, and for the human spirit.

We may go a step further, and say that among those civilised peoples who have inherited an ancient literature, and even a mythology, there is evidence of a higher order of thought among their remotest ancestors, in which there was the conception of the Supreme Being as one person—that mythology and polytheism gradually arose from the poetic representation and personification of the powers and phenomena of nature. As Professor Max Müller remarks : "When we ascend to the most distant heights of Greek history, the idea of God as the Supreme Being stands before us as a simple fact."

These remarks have an application to the subject under discussion in this chapter. It is generally acknowledged that the Celtic race has shown the possession of a strong religious nature. Their emotional and poetical nature, and their deep insight into the spiritual have led them to a religious life under all the changing circumstances of their history. In the history of the ancient Britons, with which we have been most familiar, Druidism has been commonly represented as the religion of the British Celtic race some 2,000 years ago. This arose largely from

the assumption that the ancient Britons of Cæsar's time were of one race, and that Celtic. In more recent times the suggestions of Tacitus have been duly considered, and found to be ethnologically correct, that the Silures of ancient Britain belonged to the aborigines of the country, who were Iberic and non-Aryan as to race, that they preceded the Aryan Celts in the occupation of the country; and that the rest of the Britons consisted of the two branches of the Celtic race—the older, the Goidels, Gaels; and the more recent, and finally the dominant, the Brythons, or Cymry. According to Professor Rhys the religion of the Celts of ancient Britain was not Druidism; as far as they were Celts there is no reason to suppose that they had not the same sort of religion as the Gauls and the Italians, or the Greeks and other Aryan nations. Cæsar found the Gauls given to the worship of gods, whom he roughly identified with those of Rome, namely, Jove and Minerva, Apollo and Mars, and above all, Mercury, whom they honoured more than the others. Much the same gods were probably worshipped by the Celts in Britain; and among them must have been the sea-god Nodens, who was of sufficient importance during the Roman occupation to have a temple built for him at Lydney, on the western side of the Severn; while the Irish formerly called the goddess of the Boyne his wife. Every locality had its divinity, and the rivers were specially identified with certain divine beings: witness the streams that still bear the name of Dee and kindred ones. The Dee, or Deva, of North Wales had another name, which appears in Welsh literature as Aerven, or the genius of war, and so late as the time of Giraldus it retained some of its ancient prestige. (See "Celtic Britain," pp. 67-70.)

According to this learned writer, whose conclusions we accept, the Goidelic Celts appear to have accepted Druidism, and connected it with their old polytheistic religion, but that "there is no evidence that it ever was the religion of any Brythonic people," including the Cymry. Thus he goes on to observe that "the men of Britain might perhaps be classified, so far as regards religion, into three groups:—"The Brythonic Celts, who were polytheists of the Aryan type; the non-Celtic natives under the sway of Druidism; and the Goidelic Celts, devotees of a religion which combined Aryan polytheism with Druidism." Such seems to be the most recent and the most probable conclusion in reference to the religion, or religions, of the ancient Britons. The religion of Druidism was originally the creation and the profession of the non-Aryan aborigines of Britain and also of Gaul. It was partially adopted by the Goidels, the predecessors of the Irish and the Scottish Highlanders; but was never accepted by the Brythons, the ancestors of the dominant element in the Welsh population. These Brythons, the most advanced branch of the Celtic race, continued to hold the ordinary Aryan polytheism until they adopted the Christian religion in the early period of the Christian era.

Having advanced so far, let us now proceed to inquire what was

the nature of Druidism. In most books on the subject the name has been derived from the Greek word δρύς, meaning the oak. The Welsh word for oak is *Derw*, and for Druid *Derwydd*, plural *Derwyddon*. The Irish word for Druids is Driu. These words, Greek and Celtic, are similar, and have the same roots, because they belong to the same Aryan family of languages. Pliny in his work on Natural History gives an explanation of the regard of the Druids for the oak and the mistletoe that grew upon it. His words are (xvi. 44) :—"The Druids (who are the magi of the Gauls) esteem nothing more sacred than the mistletoe, and the tree on which it grows, if only it be an oak. Indeed they select groves of oaks, and use their leaves in all their sacred rites, so that their very name of Druids may seem to be derived from the Greek name for oak (δρύς). Everything which grows upon these trees is considered by them as sent from heaven, and a sign that the tree is chosen by the deity himself. But the mistletoe is very rare to find, and where it occurs is sought with great avidity, particularly on the sixth moon, which among these nations makes the beginning of their months and years, and of a generation after thirty years, because it then has abundant strength, though not yet half of its full size. They call it in their language by a name which signifies 'all heal,' and when they have made ready their sacrifices and banquets under the tree, they bring up two white bulls, whose horns are then bound for the first time. A priest clothed in a white robe ascends the tree, and with a golden pruning-knife lops off the bough, which is caught in a white towel. Then they immolate the victims, praying that God may prosper the gift to all who shall partake of it ; for they believe that by using it as a drink barren animals are rendered fruitful, and all kinds of poisons are deprived of their noxious power."

This is Pliny's account of the ceremonies and the name of the Druids, and for many ages after him the derivation of the name from the Greek word for the oak has been accepted ; but, probably, erroneously. Pliny himself in the foregoing extract does not speak positively of the derivation from δρύς, but it only seems to be thus derived. It is now probable that the inference was erroneous. The Rev. John Pryce, M.A., vicar of Bangor, in his book, "The Ancient British Church," expresses in a note (p. 11) the most probable and correct interpretation thus :—"The constant use of this Latin word (Druidæ) as the equivalent of the vernacular term *Draoithe* = Druids, gives a clue to the correct derivation of the word Druid." The origin of the term is evidently not the Welsh *derw*, much less the Greek δρύς, but the Celtic *Drai*. Thus, in the Irish MS. of St. Paul's Epistles, at Würtzburg, the gloss on Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. iii. 8) is "da druith ægeptacdi" (duo druidæ Ægyptiaci). Draoithe also stands for "wise men" in St. Matthew ii. 1. In the Song of Trust, which St. Columba is said to have composed when, a fugitive from the royal palace of Tara, he fled by himself across the mountain, we have :—"Is e mo drai Crist mac De (Christ the Son of God is my Druid)." From this explanation we

obtain the reasonable opinion that the word "druid" was incorrectly derived from the word for oak, and that it anciently signified wise men, corresponding to the word *magi*. The association of the Druids with the mistletoe and the oak led the ancient Roman writers to draw an incorrect inference, which was aided by the similarity of the words in Greek and Celtic for an oak to the name of the Druids.

That the ceremony of the Druids described by Pliny was substantially performed seems probable, the full signification of which may not be known to us. It would seem from the description of the Druidical ceremonies given that they did regard the mistletoe as peculiarly sacred, and in all probability ascribed to it medical properties. That was frequently the case among ancient and superstitious peoples. Many of the regulations of the ancients which we deem superstitious were originally founded on sanitary grounds, or on imaginary medical properties. Pliny states that in the native language the term they used to denote the mistletoe signified *all heal*, in Latin *omnia sanantem*, "a thing that heals everything." This perception of the healing power of the plant was the foundation of the reverence paid to it. It is clear that the ceremony performed under the oak-tree on which the mistletoe grew was superstitious and magnified greatly the supposed virtue inherent in the plant.

Julius Cæsar gives us, in his book De Bello Gallico, the fullest account of the Druids in Gaul and Britain. According to him, the "system of the Druids is supposed to have been invented in Britain, and to have been introduced from that country into Gaul. To this day those who are anxious to make themselves more completely acquainted with it, frequently visit the island for the purpose of study." The opinion which Cæsar expresses as prevalent in his day, that Britain was the original home of Druidism has not been accepted by historical critics as probable. The ancient Britons in all their branches were immigrants from Gaul, which they had occupied in their journey from the East, the cradle of the human race, for ages previous to their migration to Britain. When they crossed the Channel and settled in Britain, they brought with them their manners, peculiarities, institutions, and, certainly, their religion. Druidism in its essential dogmas seemed to have a near relation to Oriental conceptions and not to Western modes of thought. It may be true that in Cæsar's time the system was more fully developed and practised in Britain than in Gaul, where it was probably partly superseded by the state, but this is no evidence that the system originated in Britain. The Druidical school in Mona, or Anglesey, was the most noted in Britain and in Europe, and drew pupils from other parts of the country and from Gaul.

The Druids formed an order well organised. They were subject to the authority of one chief, whose will was supreme among them. When the chief Druid died, the next in office succeeded him by election. If there were several of equal merit, the election

was made by the votes of the entire body. Differences of opinion would arise and party conflicts would take place, which sometimes led to war by the sword among them. This is only what has occurred among other peoples and other religions, not excluding the Christian church, where, during the middle ages, the election of the Pope sometimes led to war.

The Druids enjoyed many special privileges in the state. They were exempted from military service and from the payment of taxes, and had other immunities. The consequence was that parents sent their sons to be placed under the Druids to enjoy the privileges mentioned and to receive a good education. The privileges would be enjoyed by the Britons, and the education would be mainly sought by men from Gaul. Some of these scholars would remain under tuition for twenty years before their education would be completed. In those days the demands for labour and professions were not so great as in modern times. The course of Druidical instruction consisted largely in committing to memory the verses composed by the bards, which contained the doctrines held by the order. Cæsar explains that there were two motives for this method of instruction : to prevent the peculiar doctrines of the order from being known to the vulgar, and the other was to promote the due cultivation of the memory. The art of writing was then known among the Britons. Their dogmas were written by the priests in the Greek character, but the writings were carefully kept from the vulgar and apparently from the pupils. Some things were taught to the multitude, but the most sacred and lofty doctrines were taught only to the initiated. In this respect there was a similarity to the method of teaching among the ancient Egyptians, where the distinction was strictly made between the esoteric and exoteric instruction. Almost in every *priestly* system there has been an aversion to the throwing open of the entire body of truths to the vulgar or to the people, priests preferring to keep their power over the minds of the multitude by denying the privilege of private judgment, by the exercise of which difference of opinion may arise and possible heresy.

The Druids had much power in social and legal matters. According to Cæsar, they acted as judges and decided all disputes among tribes and individuals concerning boundaries, or inheritance, or any other matter. They tried criminals when charged with any offence, even with murder. The rewards or punishments due for any particular kind of conduct were determined by them, including the penalty of death. Disobedience to the decisions of the Druids, even on minor matters, would entail serious consequences. They would be excluded from the rites and privileges of religion, comprehending participation in the sacrifices. This last was then considered the greatest punishment, because they were reckoned among the ungodly and wicked. They were excluded from all society, and avoided by others ; and no one would go near or speak to them, lest they should be involved in the consequences of their conduct. They could get no redress for injuries done to them,

and they were excluded from all positions of honour and trust. In fact, they were placed outside the pale of the law, and were under the ban of society. Their position would be similar to that of men under the excommunication of the Roman Christian church. In the middle ages of Europe the Pope of Rome not unfrequently excommunicated monarchs, statesmen, individuals, and nations who refused to submit to his supreme authority, and the excommunicated were placed beyond the protection of the law, and had no rights. The position of men under both systems was nearly the same, showing the substantial identity of priestly systems in all ages and countries.

The Druids were, of course, sacrificial priests. Their temples were places of public worship, where an altar was erected on which sacrifices were periodically offered. The circles of stone now existing at Stonehenge, Avebury, and other places previously described, are the remains of Druidical temples. Here sacrifices of animals were offered, expressive of men's sins, and their sense of guilt and the means of divine forgiveness. A full and minute account of their modes of worship and sacrifices has not been recorded and handed down to us. There is, however, one thing mentioned by Cæsar, which requires our notice. He states : "All the Gallic nations are much given to superstition ; for which reason, when they are seriously ill, or are in danger from wars or other causes, they either offer up men as victims to the gods, or make a vow to sacrifice themselves. The ministers in these offerings are the Druids ; and they hold that the wrath of the immortal gods can only be appeased, and man's life be redeemed by offering up human sacrifice, and it is part of their national institutions to hold fixed solemnities for this purpose. Some of them make immense images of wicker-work, which they fill with men who are thus burned alive in offering to their deities. These victims are generally selected from among those who have been convicted of theft, robbery, or other crimes, in whose punishment they think the immortal gods take the greatest pleasure ; but if there be a scarcity of such victims, they do not hesitate to sacrifice innocent men in their place."

This account of Cæsar refers to the Gauls generally, and was intended to include the Britons, who came from Gaul, and had the same religion. The ordinary practice was to offer animals in sacrifice, such as sheep ; but, according to Cæsar, there were special occasions when men were made the victims. This statement of Cæsar has led to much discussion. That human sacrifices have been offered in ancient and even modern times there can be no doubt ; but, so far as our knowledge extends, we find that the practice has belonged to savage and barbarous peoples, such as the inhabitants of Western Africa in modern times. The inhabitants of Gaul and Britain in Cæsar's time were not savage barbarians, but intelligent and civilised peoples. The presumption is, therefore, that he relied too much on mere partial and imperfect reports without much discrimination. The account given by

Cæsar quoted above may suggest an explanation of the human sacrifices.

Tacitus, also, in describing the slaughter of the Druids in Mona (Annals, xiv. 30), uses the following words :—"They deemed it a duty to their deities to cover their altars with the blood of captives, and to seek the will of the gods in the entrails of men."

We venture to express the opinion, founded upon these passages, that the human sacrifices were confined to criminals and certain captives considered as criminals, and that the sacrifices were really the legal execution of criminals sentenced by the Druids, who were the judges of the land. The execution took place under Druidical authority, and in connection with Druidical ceremony. An imperfect acquaintance with the subject would lead to the conviction that human sacrifices were an ordinary part of the sacrificial system of the Druids, just as a stranger might misunderstand the system of death punishments in England by learning that men were executed under the sanction, and in connection with the ceremonies of the English church.

The Druids were also magicians and soothsayers, and the medical men of their day. The function of the magician did most probably belong to most of the priestly systems of antiquity. The Egyptian priests who opposed the claims and authority of Moses when he sought to deliver his people from the bondage of Egypt were largely magicians, and they performed their magical tricks very skilfully in imitation of the real miracles of Moses. In this respect the Druids were in accordance with their brethren, priests of the age to which they belonged.

The general teaching of the Druids concerning the greatest religious dogmas was of a high order. Our knowledge of their system has come to us through the medium of writers who were not friendly to them, or to their teaching; but we know enough to enable us to form a high estimate of their esoteric and spiritual ideas. They were accustomed to teach much "about the motions of the heavenly bodies, the magnitude of the earth and universe, the nature of things, and the power and attributes of the immortal gods." This is the representation of Cæsar. They were astronomers according to their age, and evidently occupied themselves in the study of nature and the supreme power that regulated and controlled the universe. The common people were, no doubt, polytheists, and worshipped idols, as is clearly indicated in the works referred to; but in the esoteric teaching of the Druids there was the recognition of one Supreme God, the invisible spirit that pervaded all things, and whose living activity was manifested in the order and operations of the universe. This dogma made the Druids to be akin to Oriental thinkers of antiquity, who, amidst the polytheism of the multitude, recognised one principle of unity in the existence of one God, supreme over all.

They taught clearly the immortality of the soul. Julius Cæsar asserts that: "Among their most important tenets is that of the immortality of the soul, which they believed passes after death into

other bodies; they hold this to be a great inducement to the practise of virtue, as the mind becomes relieved from the fear of death." Pomponius Mela, however, understood them to teach that the soul passed immediately into the unseen world. The two representations may not have been inconsistent, but only partial and imperfect descriptions of the Druidical teaching. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls was taught by the Grecian philosophers, including Plato, and commonly maintained in Oriental religions, ancient and modern. Ancient writers have not handed down to us a full account of the Druidical system. We must, therefore, be satisfied with a general outline.

CHAPTER VII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS AND THE ROMANS—THE INVASIONS OF JULIUS CÆSAR

In the preceding chapters our attention was almost entirely devoted to the ancient Britons themselves—their names, races, peculiarities, and religion—anterior to their relations to the stronger races which came and conquered them. We now enter upon a new part of the history of Britain, the main feature of which was the struggle for independence and freedom against successive foes, which resulted in final defeat and subjugation. The Britons had known previously what war was, and had, unfortunately, often fought amongst themselves, tribe with tribe, and nation with nation, in what we should now call civil war. The tribes themselves, however, were independent of each other, or had a qualified or semi-independence, and regarded themselves as distinct and different, who might war against each other without any disloyalty to country or kin, though they recognised themselves as members of a common race. We have no detailed account of their wars. There was no historian then to hand down records of tribal and national movements. Much of the time referred to has been designated by critical historians as prehistoric. When the Romans appeared and invaded Britain, the light of history had dawned upon the country, and in treating of that period, we have definite records to guide us, though sometimes these records are partial and coloured by the opinions and prejudices of the writers.

In the year 59 B.C. Caius Julius Cæsar was appointed the commander of the Roman troops in Gaul, with the view of entirely subjugating the country to the Roman power. The appointment was for five years. Gaul then included modern France, Switzerland, and Belgium. He left Italy to undertake his task in the following year, 58 B.C. In the course of the succeeding three years Cæsar had conquered and subdued the country, though the inhabitants rose on several occasions against the Roman power and tyranny, and some more years were required to complete the conquest over the whole of Gaul.

In the year 55 B.C. Cæsar resolved to extend his conquests beyond Gaul, and to add Britain to the Roman empire. He was a skilful commander, and a man of unbounded ambition. Britain was then considered the most westerly country, and situated on

the boundary of the world. The conceptions of it by Greek and Roman authorities were very dim. To conquer such a country, and add it to the Roman dominion, would be a notable deed, and would give much fame to the man who would accomplish it, and perhaps lead to his exaltation to the highest position in Rome. Such, probably, were the thoughts that filled the mind of Cæsar when he determined to make the attempt. He found an excuse for the expedition in the notion, or suspicion, or fabricated statement that the Britons had rendered assistance to the Gauls in the wars between them and the Romans. There is no doubt that there was much intercourse between the British tribes on the coasts and some of their brethren in Gaul, especially the Veneti, who were a seafaring tribe, and had long carried on commercial intercourse with the Britons. There is, however, no evidence that the Britons rendered military assistance to the Gauls in their wars with the Romans under Cæsar. The charge was founded on mere suspicion, or, probably, was only a mere excuse to justify Cæsar in his invasion of Britain. Military commanders, and even statesmen or politicians, in ancient and modern times have usually framed an excuse, more or less genuine, to justify them before the world in their aggressions on other countries.

Little was then known of Britain and its inhabitants, and Cæsar tried to gain some information concerning them from the Gauls on the coasts, who from commercial intercourse were supposed to know most of the Britons. His inquiries, however, were unsuccessful. They probably were unwilling to give him any definite information to assist him in his contemplated expedition. Cæsar, therefore, sent one of his own officers to obtain the necessary information, and the best place for landing. The name of this officer was Caius Volusenus, and he was placed on board a warship, so that he might survey the coast, and obtain such information as was needed. This officer, however, did not land in Britain, but contented himself with looking on from the deck of his ship, and discovering thereby the best landing-place. Although the Gauls of the coast could not, or would not, give Cæsar any information, they secretly sent intelligence to the Britons that he was preparing an expedition against them.

The news of the movement was soon spread among the Britons. On learning this, some of the British tribes sent messengers to Cæsar, and offered to submit to the Roman authority and give hostages as evidence of their fidelity. Cæsar, of course, received the messengers courteously; and after due conversation and inquiry he sent them back to their own country with many liberal promises, and with the intimation that he would soon arrive himself in Britain, and would personally receive their submission. It is not certain that the Britons who sent the messengers were sincere in their expressed willingness to submit to Cæsar; they were perhaps only desirous of gaining information about Cæsar and his expedition. It is, however, possible that these tribes were on bad terms with their countrymen, as was not rarely the case among

them. Disunion among British tribes was not uncommon. This visit of the British messengers took place during the surveying visit of Volusenus, who returned after four days, during which he gained little information. When Cæsar sent back the messengers, he ordered a friendly Gaul, by name Commius, to accompany them, and assist in persuading the Britons to submit. This Commius was a favourite of Cæsar, and he had made him king or chief over the Gallic tribe of the Atrebates, who had been conquered, a native ruler over a native tribe. Cæsar judged that Commius, the Gaul, would be likely to influence the Britons in favour of the Romans. The two peoples were of the same race, and the tradition of the migration of the Britons from Gaul was still fresh among them. The tribe of the Atrebates in Briton, who occupied the district now called Berkshire, were a portion of the Atrebates of Gaul, who previously had migrated from Gaul, and carried with them the name of their tribe. There was thus some ground for supposing that Commius would prepare the way for the coming of Cæsar and the Roman army. When Commius arrived, the Britons immediately arrested and imprisoned him, and he was not released until the arrival of Cæsar and his troops.

Cæsar hurried on his preparations for the invasion of Britain. Volusenus returned from his visit of survey and inquiry after an absence of only four days, and gave Cæsar as much information as he could, which, however, must have been small, but Cæsar professed to be satisfied. He probably indicated to Cæsar the best place on the coast for landing. The Roman army was assembled in the country of the Morini, which included the district where now are situated the French ports of Calais and Boulogne. The army consisted of two Roman legions, about 12,000 men, with a force of cavalry. Cæsar collected eighty transports for conveying the troops over the Channel, and a number of galleys, or ships of war, were to attend them. The cavalry were to follow in eighteen other ships as soon as possible. The two legions which constituted the army were the tenth and the seventh. The former was his favourite legion.

The expedition thus constituted left the port about three o'clock in the morning of August 24, or, according to some calculations, August 27. The port from which they started was called Portus Iccius, supposed to be the modern Boulogne. They arrived on the British coast about ten o'clock on the same morning after a sail of seven hours. It seems probable that the British coast which first came in view, and off which they had arrived, was Dover. Along the coast the Britons appeared in full force on the hills or on the cliffs, which seemed hills to the Romans looking on from the decks of their vessels. The perpendicular rocks, or cliffs, did not seem to Cæsar as the most suitable place for attempting to land in the face of the enemy. He resolved to cast anchor and wait there for some hours until the whole fleet came up. Then, in the afternoon, he called the officers of the fleet on board his own vessel, and gave them directions as to the manner of landing the

troops. Then, with wind and tide in their favour, the expedition was ordered by Cæsar to proceed a few miles farther, in all probability to the neighbourhood of Deal, where the shore was level, and better adapted for landing. Here Cæsar determined to land.

The Britons were seen along the coast, following the movements of the fleet. In the presence of the enemy the landing was effected with difficulty. There was, of course, no landing-stage, nothing but the sandy beach. The vessels for those days were large, and drew much water, and would not, like small boats, get very near the dry land to disembark the men. The soldiers were much weighted with armour and arms. They had, under the example of their leaders, to jump into the water, which was rather deep and difficult, and struggle to get at the land. In the meantime the Britons commenced to attack them from the land and from the shallow water, and to throw upon the struggling Romans showers of missiles. The Roman soldiers, unaccustomed to this kind of warfare, hesitated, and showed some alarm under these novel circumstances. The Britons advanced in the water to meet them, and when they reached the dry land, and formed into rank in small parties, the Britons attacked them. The Romans, however, persevered, and succeeded in landing all their men, and putting the soldiers into order for battle. The vessels of war, under Cæsar's orders, manned their small boats, and ordered them to render assistance where the Roman soldiers were in danger of being overpowered. The Britons were terrified, and soon fled. The Roman cavalry had not arrived from Gaul, and Cæsar regretted that he was unable to pursue the Britons in the absence of the cavalry.

The Britons had shown courage in the early attacks ; but, when the Romans had succeeded in landing and placing themselves in the order of battle, they seem to have lost courage and fled. Probably they were not numerous, and saw that they could not stand against the disciplined Romans under the command of Julius Cæsar, the ablest commander of the day. They made no further stand, and no effort to gather the interior tribes to their assistance. The British troops engaged in this preliminary fighting were probably confined to the southern district, where the landing took place, and perhaps the tribes of the interior were not on friendly terms with them. Thinking that they had no chance, the Britons in the course of a few days sent messengers to Cæsar to negotiate for peace. Accompanying the messengers was Commius, the Gaul, previously sent by Cæsar to negotiate with the Britons, whom, however, they had seized and imprisoned. This was even then considered a breach of international law, or custom. The Britons, through their envoys, excused themselves by throwing the blame on the multitude, or, as we should say, on the mob. Cæsar quite understood the excuse, but, being desirous to terminate the war soon, accepted the apology and overlooked the offence. He demanded, as a condition of peace, that they should hand over a number of hostages for their future good behaviour. This was

in accordance with the customs of war in those days. This was agreed upon, and some were at once delivered over, and the remainder, who were to come from the interior of the country, were promised in a few days.

The Romans had to wait a few days, which they employed in procuring food and preparing to return to Gaul. In the meantime the Roman cavalry, which had been detained for some days on the coast of Gaul, arrived on the British coast on August 30, four days later. The weather suddenly changed, and became stormy. Some of the vessels were driven back, and others along the coast. The attempt to anchor was a failure, and they were obliged to return to Gaul. The following night added to the Roman difficulties. The storm continued. The moon was full, and the season for the high tide had come. The ships that had been drawn up on the beach were filled with water, and the other vessels that were at anchor were seriously damaged by the high tide and the storm. Some were destroyed and others injured, so as to be rendered almost useless. The condition of the Romans in camp was alarming. The means of returning to Gaul seemed to be cut off, and the provisions for remaining in Britain had not been made. The Britons became aware of the straits in which the Romans were placed. They came to the conclusion, from the size of the camp, that the Romans were not as numerous as they had previously imagined, and that, without cavalry, ships, or provisions, they were helpless, and might be destroyed. The British chiefs in the Roman camp managed to leave it and to join their countrymen in an attempt to destroy the invading army, The Britons collected more troops from the interior and prepared to make a fresh attack. In the meantime, the Romans, aware of their danger, exerted themselves to prepare for a retreat to Gaul, or to winter in Britain. Some of the damaged ships were broken up and the materials used for repairing the rest. Great efforts were made to collect provisions for the camp, and this was done without any hindrance.

Cæsar, however, suspected the Britons, and kept a good watch on their movements. The pickets, who were sent out to protect the foragers, sent information to the camp that the enemy were advancing. Cæsar immediately hurried forward with the cohorts on guard, and ordered all the available soldiers to follow. He found that the foragers were surrounded by the Britons. The Roman foragers, suspecting no danger, had piled their arms, and commenced to reap the corn in the fields ; the Britons attacked them and slew several. The Romans then formed a solid square to protect themselves against the British troops, which consisted of chariots, cavalry, and foot soldiers, who threw into them showers of missiles. The arrival of the two legions under Cæsar soon relieved the besieged troops, and drove the Britons away. Not deeming it prudent to assume the offensive and to follow the retreating Britons, the legions returned to the camp without suffering any great loss. This, however, did not end the conflict. The

Britons collected their troops and advanced to the Roman camp, expecting to conquer and secure much booty and deliver their country from the foreign foe. They had, however, underestimated the power and resources of the Romans. In the meantime Cæsar had received a small force of cavalry, only thirty, under Commius, which he had brought from Gaul. A battle ensued, and the Britons were defeated and fled. The Romans pursued, burning dwellings in their progress. Having pursued until the soldiers were exhausted, Cæsar ordered the legions to return to camp. The pursuit was probably only for a few miles.

This ended the fighting. The Britons on the same day sent envoys to the Roman camp to sue for peace. Cæsar, desirous of returning to Gaul at once, agreed to peace, requiring only that the hostages should be doubled. He did not wait for the hostages to be surrendered, but ordered them to be sent after him. He left Britain immediately, and crossed over to Gaul without any further difficulty or loss. Thus ended the first invasion of England by Julius Cæsar. The time spent from the departure of the fleet from the port in Gaul to its return has been estimated to be about three weeks. Cæsar in that time could not have seen much of Britain or the Britons. The operations were obviously confined to a small district within a few miles of the place where the Romans landed. The troops who opposed him were probably only a few thousands belonging to the coast region. The tribes of the interior had not time to take a part in the war, and probably many of them knew nothing of the expedition. It served Cæsar's ambitious purpose to magnify the results of the war, and to describe the victories as involving the conquest of Britain, but such was not the case. The invasion was a preliminary to future operations, and nothing more.

When Cæsar returned to Gaul, he received intelligence which led him to hasten to Italy. Before leaving, however, he ordered his officers left in command to make extensive preparations for a second invasion of Britain in the following year. Cæsar returned, and found that his subordinates had been diligent during the winter in making the necessary arrangements—transports, horses, and provisions. Some delay was caused by the rebellious disposition of some of the Gallic tribes, which he had to punish. A strong north-west wind arose, and continued for twenty-five days, and still further delayed the expedition. However, on July 20, B.C. 54, the expedition set sail about eight o'clock in the evening, or sunset. The place of departure was called Portus Itius, supposed to be Issant, near to Boulogne, or, perhaps, Boulogne itself. The magnitude of this second invasion of Britain may be estimated by the following figures. The troops consisted of five legions, or about 30,000, including auxiliaries, and 2,000 cavalry. The ships of war and the vessels for transport numbered about 800. The expedition proceeded under a favourable wind during the night, and arrived off the British coast early in the morning. The landing was effected at nearly the same place as in the previous

year. The fleet had by change of the wind and the flow of the tide drifted somewhat beyond the North Foreland, and had to return to the place fixed on for landing. The appearance of such a large expedition had terrified the Britons. Never before had such a formidable force approached the British shores, consisting of more than 30,000 well-disciplined troops. It could not be expected that the Britons, broken up into different tribes, not in harmony within themselves, could resist successfully the progress of such an invading army. The landing was not opposed. Cæsar, soon after landing, resolved to advance against the Britons, whose fortified position was about twelve Roman miles distant. This position was ascertained from prisoners taken, and was situated in a woody district, and constructed of earthworks and timber. Britain then was a country of woods and forests, and their villages and strong places were situated in clearings within these woods.

The position of the Britons was a strong one, but Cæsar resolved to storm it. In their approach to the neighbourhood of this fortified position, they were met by the British troops, horsemen and chariots, on the banks of a river, supposed to be the Stour ; but they were driven back by the Roman cavalry, and retired to their stronghold, whose approaches were blocked by felled trees. From this position the Britons sent out skirmishers to inflict damage on the advancing foe and to prevent them entering their fortress. But all was vain. The Roman soldiers, especially the seventh legion, made the attack in their customary manner, designated the *tortoise*, or *testudo*, method. The men stood together in files three feet apart. The front rank held their shields in front, and the other shields were held overhead, the length being at right angles to the file. In this way the soldiers locked their shields together, so as to protect their heads and bodies against the missiles which would be thrown upon them. Then they piled bush and faggots in the ditch, and advanced step by step over the mound which was in front of the defences. They made a rush over the intervening space and captured the position without much loss. The Britons, unaccustomed to this skilful mode of warfare, fled from the fortress, which was occupied by the Romans. Cæsar did not order any immediate advance against the retreating Britons, as he desired to fortify his camp at once.

The next day he sent three columns in pursuit ; but, before any action had taken place, news arrived that great damage had been done to the fleet by the storm of the preceding night. Cæsar then recalled the pursuing columns and retreated hastily to the camp. He found that the damage had not been exaggerated. About forty ships had been wrecked and the remainder injured. He at once ordered his men to repair the vessels. This was done in the course of ten days ; and for greater safety the ships were drawn up on shore and included within the limits of the fortified camp. Having thus made his ships and camp on the coast safe, he directed

his course to the neighbourhood of the British camp which he had captured.

Whilst the Romans were occupied in repairing the fleet, the Britons were employed in healing their divisions and mustering their forces. When Cæsar arrived, the various tribes were at war with themselves, but the presence of a powerful enemy led them to come to an agreement, and unite in mutual defence. They appointed as their leader, or commander-in-chief, the king of the Catuvelauni, whose territory was probably the present county of Hertford, on the north of the Thames. The name of this chief was Caswallon, or, in Latin, Cassivellaunus. Under his leadership a confederation of the tribes of the south-east of Britain was formed. The Romans advanced and were bravely met by the Britons. They did not venture to meet the Romans in a pitched battle, but harassed them in their march, and attacked them by sudden onslaughts, made successively from their sheltered position in the woods. After an attack they would retreat to their woody shelters, and the Romans were unable to pursue, owing to their heavy armour. Sometimes the Britons would make a feigned retreat to allure the Romans away from the main body, and then they would attack them and inflict much loss. The British cavalry and the chariots attacked the Roman horse, and inflicted much loss, though finally obliged to retreat. They even attacked the Roman cohorts, who were protecting the camp, they broke through the Roman lines, succeeded against two cohorts numbering 600 each, and were compelled to retreat only by the arrival of large Roman reinforcements. This desultory method of attacking was so successful that the Britons became more confident, and they ventured on a more open and general warfare.

The day after the skirmishes described, the Britons in considerable numbers posted themselves on hills not very far from the Roman camp to await the Roman advance. About noon Cæsar ordered Caius Trebonius with three legions and the cavalry to advance for the purpose of foraging. Then the Britons went forward and surrounded the foragers, and cut them off from the main body. The Romans then advanced and made a general attack, and soon succeeded in putting them to flight and pursuing them for some distance. This was something like a battle in the open field. According to Cæsar's account, the British reinforcements, which were coming up from all sides, disbanded, and the Britons never again came to a general engagement in that district. Cæsar now led his army in person towards the Thames with the intention of invading the territory of Cassivellaunus. Arriving on the bank of the river, he saw that a large British force was drawn up on the other side. The river could be crossed on foot only at one place, and that was made more difficult by the Britons, who had planted sharp stakes in the bed of the river beneath the water and on the bank. The exact spot here described as a ford has been a subject of controversy, but nothing certain is known of the place. The Roman infantry dashed into the river and waded up to their necks

in the water and crossed over. The cavalry had been sent in advance. The attack of cavalry and foot was so impetuous that the Britons abandoned the bank and fled. Probably Cæsar has given only a partial account of the event. Cassivellaunus determined not to engage the Romans in open battle. He disbanded the greater part of his forces and retained only 4,000, including chariots, by which he might harass and impede the progress of the Romans. He retired to his shelters in the wood, and issued therefrom to assault the separate bands of Roman soldiers. He cleared the country of men, cattle, and food along which the Romans had to pass. The stragglers of the Roman army were quickly cut off. This method of warfare was trying for the Romans, but did not stop their progress.

It was now obvious to the Britons that they could not hope to succeed against such an army of well-disciplined troops, probably exceeding in number the forces that Cassivellaunus could bring against them. Moreover, the spirit of disunion common amongst the native tribes now showed itself. Cassivellaunus was elected the commander-in-chief of the confederated tribes because of his ability, but he was not loved or trusted by them. The powerful tribe of the Trinobantes, who occupied the modern county of Essex and part of Middlesex, and perhaps South Suffolk, were the first to send a message to Cæsar to ask for peace, and offering to submit on certain conditions. This tribe had previously been conquered by Cassivellaunus, and their young king, Mandubratius, whose father had been killed by Cassivellaunus, had fled to Gaul, and was at the time in Cæsar's camp. The Trinobantes requested that Mandubratius should be restored to them as their king. The agreement was made by Cæsar, and Mandubratius was sent to rule his tribe as a tributary to the Romans. Forty hostages were given to Cæsar, and corn was supplied to his army. Other tribes followed their example. These were the Cenimagni, who probably occupied the county of Suffolk; the Segontiaci, who peopled the greater part of the district now called Berkshire and Hampshire; the Bibroci were the inhabitants of the remaining parts of Berkshire and Hampshire, including, in part, the forest of Anderida. The Ancalites occupied, probably, the north of Berkshire and the west border of Middlesex. The Cassi, perhaps the same as the Catyeuchlani, occupied portions of the counties of Buckingham, Bedford, and Hertford. These tribes sent envoys to treat with Cæsar for peace, and they gave to him information concerning the town, or place, which Cassivellaunus held as the centre of his operations and the capital of his dominion, a town explained by Cæsar to be a piece of forest where the trees had been felled, fortified by a ditch and a rampart. Cæsar at once marched to this place, which was only a few miles distant. He immediately attacked the town from two sides, and, though the place was strong by nature and by art, and was bravely defended, the Britons could not resist the assaults, and they evacuated the place, losing many men, and large numbers of cattle.

Cæsar was now in possession of large tracts of the country, extending from the sea of the south to that of the east, inhabited by the tribes mentioned, who had submitted to him. There remained, however, in the south Cantium, from which the name of the county of Kent has been derived. This district was then ruled by four native chiefs, sometimes called kings, whose names were, according to Cæsar, Cingetorix, Carvilius, Taximagulus, and Segonax. These were the Latinised forms of the native British names. Cassivellaunus, now driven from his own stronghold, induced the four chiefs of Cantium to join him in an attack on the Roman camp, with the view of cutting the Romans off from the coast. The attack was unsuccessful, and the Britons lost many men, including an important chief named Lugotorix, who was taken prisoner. This really ended the war, and Cassivellaunus, through the medium of Commius, offered to submit. The terms were easily settled. The Britons agreed to hand over a number of hostages, to pay an annual tribute to Rome, and Cassivellaunus was ordered not to disturb the other tribes. Cæsar was anxious to return to Gaul immediately, as some disquieting news had reached him. He started at once, taking the British hostages with him. He reached the camp on the coast, and found that the ships that had been injured by the storm had been repaired. He sent a part of his men over at once, and the vessels were to return for the remainder. In the return of the empty vessels some were lost, but Cæsar crowded the vessels that had come back, and they arrived safely at their destination in Gaul.

The description of his marches in Britain and the places where the battles took place given by Cæsar himself is so general and indefinite that it is impossible to identify them with certainty. The stronghold of Caswallon, which the Romans assaulted and captured, has been represented by some writers as Verulamium, adjoining the town of St. Albans. There is, however, no clear evidence in support of this identification. This second expedition of Cæsar has been described as a wonderful and successful one. The time occupied from the departure from Gaul to the final return was only about two months, from July 20 to the latter end of September. Cæsar, of course, was regarded as the conqueror of Britain, as having brought under Roman power a new world situated at the westerly extremity of the earth. The conquest, however, was only of a small portion of Britain. He had not penetrated into the interior of the country, and had seen only a few tribes, who were brave and intelligent. Tacitus correctly described the expedition as resulting, not in a real conquest, but as preliminary to those who followed him.

Britain was now abandoned by the Romans, and remained unvisited for nearly a century—from B.C. 54 to A.D. 43. In this interval the country was regarded as belonging to the Roman dominion, which soon became an empire. The Britons were allowed to govern themselves, and their subjection was only nominal. The tribute was paid very irregularly, and some portion

of the time not at all. During this period the British chiefs and tribes lived as before, frequently at variance with each other, and engaging in war. We have not any clear and detailed history of the country, but only small indications of the state of life therein given on the coins issued during the period, and incidental references by some Roman writers. The Britons cultivated the spirit of friendship with the Romans, imitated to some extent their manners and mode of life, and erected towns proper on their old village sites. Some of their chiefs visited Rome, and travellers from Italy came to Britain.

Some British chiefs became conspicuous during this period. The most important bore the name of Commius. Some writers think that he was the same Commius as the one employed by Cæsar as a medium between him and the Britons. Others entertain a different opinion. Anyhow he bore the same name, and played an important part in British affairs after the departure of Cæsar and the Romans. This chief had three sons, namely, Tincommius, Verica, and Eppillus. The district over which Commius ruled included probably Kent, Surrey, Sussex, Hampshire, and a portion of Wiltshire. The three sons jointly succeeded their father in the government of this district. Whether they divided the territory between them, or ruled jointly, is only a matter of conjecture. The three had their names together on one coin that is known. The survivor of the three was Eppillus. Commius did not assume the position of king, but the last of his sons called himself king on some of his coins. Another important chief was Tasciovanus, or Tasciovarius, in the Latin form. The capital of his dominion was Verulam, or Verulamium, which was near the town of St. Albans. This name appears on some of the coins issued by him. He had two sons, Cunobelinus, or Cunobeline (the Cymbeline of Shakespeare), and Epaticus. The father was a man of power, and seemed to have succeeded to the prominent position held by Cassivellaunus during the time of Cæsar's invasion. It has been conjectured that Tasciovarius was the son or grandson of Cassivellaunus. Of the two sons the most important and powerful was Cunobeline, who assumed the name of king, and whose capital is named on his coins as Camulodunum, or Colchester. The people over whom Cunobeline reigned were the Catuvelauni, who under Cassivellaunus tyrannised over the neighbouring tribes, especially the Trinobantes. We have no detailed history of their action during this period, but some of the coins issued by Cunobeline show that he ruled over the Trinobantes, and had made Camulodunum his capital, implying a previous conquest of the country. This chief had three sons, Adminius, Caractacus, or Caradoc, and Togodumnus. Disputes arose in his own family, and Adminius was banished, and fled to Rome, and sought the protection of the Emperor Caligula. Then King Cunobeline died about A.D. 40, and his dominions were divided between his two sons, Caractacus and Togodumnus. This brings us to the times when the Romans again invaded Britain. Caligula was supposed to be mad, and he made

pretended arrangements for crossing the Channel, instigated by Adminius, and invading the country, but nothing came of it. Claudius succeeded Caligula as Emperor of Rome, and under his reign began the movement by which Britain was subdued and occupied by the Romans, which will be described in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

A.D. 43—77

THE BRITONS AND THE ROMANS UNDER CLAUDIUS

THE Britons in the first half of the first century of the Christian era were, as formerly, in a divided state, and were at war amongst themselves. The account of their divisions which has come down to us is very imperfect. The sons of the celebrated Cunobeline appear to have exercised a tyrannical power towards the sons of the renowned Commius. One of these sons, named Bericus, or, perhaps, the same as Veric, fled from the country, the probable result of an unsuccessful war amongst the native tribes. He retired to Rome, and sought the aid of the Emperor Claudius to restore him to his position. Claudius probably cared nothing for Bericus, or Veric, but he thought that the application was a good opportunity and a good excuse for preparing an expedition for the entire conquest of Britain. The Britons had sent an envoy to demand the surrender of Veric as a fugitive and a rebel; but Claudius rejected the demand, and resolved to invade the country. The Britons were also reminded of their irregular payments of the tribute previously agreed upon. These reasons, or excuses, were quite sufficient to induce the Emperor to gratify his ambition to perform some military exploit by which he could secure a triumph.

The expedition was placed under the command of Aulus Plautius, a senator of distinction, who had been fourteen years previously consul and then held the position of commander in Gaul. The troops were assembled in Gaul, and then they murmured, and refused to embark, on the ground that Britain was beyond the limits of the known world. The Emperor sent his favourite freedman, Narcissus, from Rome to pacify them. At first the troops insulted him, but afterwards returned to obedience, and expressed their willingness to embark. The date usually mentioned when the expedition started is A.D. 43. According to Dr. Guest in his "Origines Celticæ," vol. ii. p. 396, the friendly relations between Britain and Rome had ceased in A.D. 42, and the preparations were made in that year, and the winter was allowed to pass before the expedition started. Some writers state that the army embarked in the *autumn* of 43, but Guest states that it was most probably in the *spring* of that year.

The expedition consisted of four legions, which were the second, the ninth, the fourteenth, and the twentieth. These legions numbered nearly 25,000 men. In addition to the legions proper, there were Gallic auxiliaries, estimated by some writers as equal in number to the four legions, making an army of about 50,000. A more moderate estimate has placed them at 40,000. Anyhow the expedition was a formidable one, an organised and well-disciplined army of 40,000 or more, brought against a people represented by the Romans as brave, but semi-barbarous. According to the common account, they embarked at the same port as Cæsar started from ; but in the opinion of an able critic, Mr. John Bellows, of Gloucester, the ships that bore the troops sailed from the mouth of the Rhine. After a stormy and long passage, the troops landed without any opposition. There is no clear indication in the accounts of the expedition where the troops landed. According to a recent German writer, Dr. Hübner, the place of landing was somewhere in the neighbourhood of Southampton ; and from this place the Romans marched in search of the enemy in the direction of Winchester and Silchester. There is a general agreement that the Britons were taken by surprise and were not prepared to meet the Romans in the field. They retired to their natural defences, the woods and marshes, and, being without any plans for combined action, they did not at first venture to attack the Romans ; but when they commenced to fight, it was in detachments, issuing suddenly from their fastnesses with some measure of success. The chiefs who were then the most prominent were the two sons of the king Cunobeline, who had recently died. The names of these British chiefs were Caractacus (or Caradoc), and Togodumnus, who commanded the combined British forces when gradually brought together. The latter chief was probably king of the Catuvelauni in succession to his father, and it is supposed that Caractacus was placed over the westerly part of the dominion of the Catuvelauni, which included Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire. The account of the campaign has been given by the Roman historian Dio Cassius, but there is so much obscurity in the narrative that it is difficult to make out a consistent story of the places and events mentioned. The district which now comprehends Oxfordshire and Gloucestershire was then apparently under the power of the Catuvelauni, and formed the westerly border. The ancient accounts seem to mix up this part of the country with the ordinary district of the Catuvelauni, so as to render the identification of the places and rivers difficult. The people who inhabited these two counties were called the Dobuni, or, as some name them, the Boduni, the dwellers of the hills. Others explain the difference in the names as having arisen from the change in the initial letter B for D. In the march of the Romans under Plautius in the pursuit of the Britons, they arrived in the district of the Dobuni, and there the battles took place which resulted in the flight of the British commanders and their troops and the submission of the Dobuni. After these events, in another part of the

country, several battles took place. The Britons under their two great commanders offered a stout resistance to the progress of the Romans. After the submission of the Dobuni, amongst whom Plautius had placed a garrison, the Britons retired to the south, and Plautius pursued them. The Britons had placed themselves in a strong position near a great river, supposed by many to be the Medway, but there is some doubt on this point. This river was crossed. The Gauls in the Roman army swam across, and the Romans crossed higher up by means of a bridge. The Britons fell back on the Thames, and the Romans pursued; but, becoming entangled in the Essex marshes, lost many men. The Britons continued to defend themselves not unsuccessfully. The Romans now began to secure the portions of territory already conquered, and advanced no farther. Plautius sent word to the Emperor Claudius inviting him to come in person and conduct the campaign, which then was in a very doubtful condition.

During the several battles of this period the king, Togodumnus, was slain, and the conduct of the war on the British side devolved entirely on Caractacus. In the army under Plautius were two officers who subsequently became notorious as emperors, namely, Vespasian and his son Titus. They both showed much bravery and skill, the son on one occasion saving the life of his father when surrounded by the Britons. In these British battles these two men were undergoing their training for the greater task of conquering the Jews and destroying Jerusalem. The Romans seem to have remained on the defensive, until the arrival of the Emperor Claudius, who hastened to proceed from Rome to Britain on the receipt of the summons. He travelled by sea from Ostia to Marseilles, by overland route across Gaul, and, crossing the Channel, he joined the Roman army under Plautius on the banks of the Thames. He brought with him additional troops, including war elephants. The Roman historians differ in their accounts of the battles fought during Claudius' stay in Britain. According to Dio Cassius, Claudius, at the head of the combined Roman army, advanced against the Britons and crossed the Thames. The Britons had collected many troops to defend their country, and fought bravely, as they usually did. They were, however, defeated, and their capital, Camulodunum, the modern Colchester, the seat of the dynasty of Cunobeline, was captured. This battle seemed decisive for that part of Britain, but not for the entire country. The tribes of that region submitted to the Romans. After witnessing this success, Claudius left Britain and returned to Rome, having been absent only about six months. His British successes were magnified, and he was honoured by a splendid triumph, and the title of Britannicus was given to him and his son, and a coin was issued to commemorate these victories over the Britons.

Claudius left the army in Britain under the command of Aulus Plautius, who had previously done most of the work of fighting. The conquests above described related only to the south-eastern parts of Britain. The greater part of Britain was, so far,

untouched. The war continued in other portions of the country. The renowned British king and commander Caractacus, or Caradoc, became prominent, and, in fact, was the commander-in-chief of the combined British forces, and the scene of the war was changed to the south-western parts of the country. The war continued under Plautius without any great success, and Plautius was recalled to Rome, and, in the year 47 A.D., he received there an ovation for his military success. Vespasian, the future emperor, was vested with the supreme command. It is reported by the Roman historians, especially by Suetonius, who flourished in the latter half of the first century, that Vespasian at the head of the Roman army marched against the tribes of the south-west, and attacked them, because they had rendered assistance to their countrymen in the recent war. The tribes which he conquered and subdued are described as two most powerful tribes (*duæ gentes*). The struggle was long and destructive, and about thirty battles were fought, and twenty British towns, or fortified positions, were captured. The story of Titus having saved his father when surrounded by the Britons is pronounced by some historians as a fiction, as he was then only a boy. It has been a matter of controversy which were the two powerful tribes conquered by Vespasian. The island of Vectis was conquered at the same time. This island is generally understood to be the Isle of Wight ; consequently the scene of the war must have been the south-west. Some think that one of the tribes was the Durotriges, the dwellers on the waters of the sea, the counties of Dorset and Wilts. According to these writers, the region of the war was Hampshire, Dorsetshire, and Wiltshire. According to other writers, the most probable opinion is that the two powerful tribes were those known as the Belgæ and the Dumnonii, the inhabitants of most of the south-west from Hampshire to Cornwall. This is perhaps the most generally accepted opinion ; but the description given in the Roman histories is brief, general, and indefinite.

Vespasian left Britain and returned to Rome, and the Roman army remained for a time without a commander. In the year 50, Ostorius Scapula was appointed the governor and commander in Britain. The interval between the departure of Plautius and Vespasian was one of inactivity on the part of the Romans, though the celebrated second legion was in the country, having been brought there by Vespasian. The Britons, however, were not idle, but attacked and plundered the native tribes who had submitted to the Romans. When Ostorius arrived he at once collected all his forces, and, suddenly falling on the Britons, defeated them with great loss. Then he proceeded to construct a series of forts, with the view of keeping the tribes in check within the limits of two rivers, one of which was the Severn, but the other is regarded as uncertain ; some consider it as the Avon, and others the Nen, but some think it was the Trent. These two rivers are supposed to be the boundaries of the Roman province at that time. There is, however, much obscurity in the account which Tacitus has given of these events.

The policy of Ostorius was so distasteful, even to those tribes who had been previously friendly and submissive, that they rose in rebellion. The chief of these tribes were the Iceni, who were the most powerful tribe in the eastern part of the country, occupying the district now known as Suffolk, Norfolk, Huntingdon, and Cambridgeshire. The Romans attacked them in their fortified position and defeated them, through their skill, discipline, and valour, though the Iceni fought bravely. The spot where this battle took place has not been recorded. The tribes then submitted, including the Iceni. The important and powerful tribes of the interior of the country had not yet come much into contact with the Romans. The most powerful of these were the Brigantes, who occupied a large part of the country from Northumberland to Cheshire, including Yorkshire and Lancashire. Other smaller tribes in their neighbourhood were subject to them. In the march of the Romans westward, Ostorius heard that the Brigantes were disturbed and threatened war against the common enemy. Ostorius marched back to the north to subdue the Brigantes ; but after the discouraging defeat of the Iceni, they did not venture to enter upon a war with the Romans, but made peace with them by submission. By this pacific settlement Ostorius was set free to advance to the west. He marched towards the large tribe of the Ordovices, who occupied the district of North Wales and the adjoining country of Shropshire.

The great British general, who now again became prominent, was Caractacus, or, to give his British name, Caradoc. He was the son of the British king Cunobeline, king of the country of which Colchester was the capital. He commanded the confederated British forces in the south-west, and continued the war for some years ; but he was defeated, and he had to retire from his native district. He was elected king, or chief, of the renowned tribe of the Silures. He was not himself a Silurian, but the Silures were in some way connected with the Catuvelauni, in the south-east. The Silures occupied the large district in South Wales, probably between the lower course of the river Severn and Cardigan Bay. They were not, as previously explained, a Celtic race, but belonged to the aborigines of the country, and were not Aryan, but a branch of the primitive Iberic race. They were a very brave and warlike people. In the dangers that threatened the country, they appointed Caradoc their commander-in-chief. He entered into an alliance with the powerful tribe of the Ordovices, who were of the pure Cymric or Brythonic race, and occupied the territory of North Wales and Shropshire. The Romans were determined to attack these two peoples, who had formed a confederacy against them. Caradoc did not wait in his own country for the attack of the Romans, but marched into the territory of the Ordovices. The two opposing forces drew near each other. The precise place where they met and fought has been a matter of controversy. Caractacus fixed upon a strong place, which he fortified with ramparts, intending to fight on the

defensive, perhaps not willing to face the disciplined and trained legions of Rome. The place is described as a hill, on the slopes of which the ramparts of stone were placed. In front of this hill, of course, at the bottom, there flowed a river difficult to cross. Several conjectures have been thrown out as to the locality.

According to Dr. Merivale the place was Coxall Knoll, near Lentwardine, in Shropshire, on the river Teme. It is said that earthworks are still to be seen on the hill. In recent times Malvern Hill has been fixed upon as the scene of the battle, and a cantata has been composed in celebration of the hero and the battle on this hill. The opinion is improbable. The locality hitherto regarded as the scene of the conflict by most writers is a hill on the river *Ony* in the south-west of Shropshire, near the confluence of the Clun and the Teme. This place still bears the name of Caer Caradoc, or the fortress of Caradoc. It is perhaps impossible to determine the precise position with certainty, but the first and the last of the three sites mentioned are sufficiently probable to allow us to leave the question to the determination of each intelligent reader, the last being the most probable.

The battle fought was an important one, and terminated the heroic career of the British commander, after several years of a great war against the Romans, during which he gained many victories ; but finally had to surrender to the stronger and more disciplined forces of the Roman legions.

The battle was fought bravely on both sides. The various British chiefs who had brought their troops to fight for their country under Caractacus encouraged them to contend vigorously for freedom. Caractacus himself went amongst the troops, and appealed to them to fight heroically in the battle about to begin, as the result would finally decide whether they should be a free people or slaves in chains for ever. He referred to the struggles of a hundred years ago, when they drove back the Romans under Cæsar, and had as the consequence remained free up to that time. The British troops were excited to enthusiasm by the brave king's appeal, and with wild shouts they swore that they would not yield to the invader. The enthusiasm of the Britons and the strength of their position made an impression on the mind of Ostorius, the Roman general, and he seemed disposed to pursue the method of skilful manœuvring. His soldiers, however, demanded that they should be led to attack the enemy in front. This military spirit was, of course, pleasing to Ostorius, who knew the bravery and the skill of his men. He had made himself acquainted with the position of the Britons, and had perceived the weakest part of their defences. The command was given to advance. Ostorius led them on, and not without difficulty they crossed the river. Then they began to ascend the hill, and, amidst showers of missiles, attacked the ramparts. Here the Romans suffered much, and lost many men. According to the usual Roman method of warfare, when they arrived at the ram-

parts, the soldiers "closed their ranks, and placed their shields over them; they soon tore down the rough irregular piles of stones, and, attacking the enemy on level ground, obliged them to flee to the heights." Such is the account given by Tacitus. The light and heavy armed soldiers pursued them. The Britons, whose arms were inferior, and who had no shields nor helmets to protect them, were thrown into disorder and fled. There was no lack of courage on the part of the Britons, but they gave way before superior discipline and arms of precision. This has usually been the lot even of brave men when contending against superior skill and more destructive weapons of war in ancient and modern times.

The defeat was complete. The wife and daughter of Caractacus accompanied him in the campaign, and they were made prisoners. According to some representations, the residence of the British king, Caer Caradoc, was captured, and the entire family taken prisoners. Two brothers of the king who had taken part in the battle, surrendered. Caractacus himself, however, escaped from the field of battle, and proceeded to the country of the Brigantes in the north, where he claimed the protection of the queen Cartismandua, who was related to him. The queen, however, desirous of remaining on terms of friendship with the Romans, surrendered him a prisoner to his enemies. Thus the greatest British general of the time ended his public life after a military struggle against the Romans of several years, extending, probably, from A.D. 43, when the Claudian expedition arrived in the country, to A.D. 50, when the decisive battle took place. Precise dates may be wanting for these events, but the figures given are substantially correct. Caradoc, his wife, and daughters were sent prisoners to Rome. His fame had preceded him. The usual spectacle of the prisoners was made in Rome. The procession made its way to the thrones erected for Claudius and the Empress Agrippina, who sat in front of the standards and the tribunal. The people and the prætorians thronged the military camp, or Campus Martius. The vassals of Caradoc were in the front part of the procession, then his brothers followed, and afterwards his daughter and his wife, and finally himself. His vassals and attendants prostrated themselves before the Emperor Claudius and the Empress Agrippina; but Caractacus alone stood erect. Then the historian placed in the mouth of the captive king a speech worthy of his noble character. "My present lot," he is reported as saying, "is as glorious to you as it is degrading to myself . . . you are indeed determined to rule the whole world; but does it follow that all the world is to welcome servitude? Had I been at once surrendered to your power, neither my fall nor your triumph would have gained their present distinction. Put me to death, and my whole story will be forgotten. Spare me, and your clemency will be remembered for ever."

This is the language in which Tacitus expressed the demeanour and the lofty spirit of Caractacus. It made an impression on the

mind of Claudius, and induced him to pardon the noble-minded prisoner, his wife, and daughter ; but they were not allowed to return to Britain, but had to remain prisoners all the days of their life. The capture of Caractacus did not end the war. The Silures and their allies continued the struggle, however hopeless it may have seemed. Many battles were fought, and the Britons gained several victories, on one occasion nearly exterminating the Romans. Encouraged by these successes, the Silures carried on for some time a desultory war, which greatly enraged the Roman commander, who threatened to exterminate the entire race, and extinguish the name. In the midst of these events, and harassed by the misconduct of his officers and the activity of the Silures, Ostorius died. He was succeeded by an old officer, Didius Gallus. In the meantime a Roman legion had been defeated by the Silures ; but the new commander, on his arrival, at once advanced against and defeated them. The Romans, under their new general, did not make much progress in the war. A new difficulty arose to the invaders in the disaffection of the Brigantes, whose Queen, Cartismandua, caused much dissatisfaction to the Britons generally, and many of her own subjects, by her surrender of Caractacus to the Romans, and by her friendship to the invaders. This led to a civil war. She had married one of her own chiefs, of the name of Venusius. They soon, however, disagreed on the question of supreme power. Venusius wanted the queen to surrender the royal power to him, but the queen refused, and a civil war ensued. The queen had on her side the majority, and her husband had to retire ; and he became the supreme commander over the Silures and their allies. Under his command, the victory over the Roman legion, under Manlius Valens had been gained before the arrival of Didius Gallus. The aged Roman commander, Didius, did not effect much in person, but left the continuation of the war to younger men, under his direction.

It is probable that about this time the Romans advanced into the country of the Silures, and placed the famous second legion at Isca Caerleon, in Monmouthshire. The precise dates and movements of that period are not well known, and some things are only matters of inference. It is, however, certain that Caerleon, on the river Usk, did become the headquarters of the second legion about this time. Portions of the legion went forth from these headquarters, and occupied other places in the neighbourhood of the Severn, including Gloucester, or Glevum, and also Cirencester. Some have maintained that the Romans had occupied these places at an earlier period, anterior to their advance on Caerleon, the latter being an extension of the former. However this may be, we know that the whole of this region, from Cirencester to Caerleon, including Gloucester, was in the occupation of the Romans from an early period, and became an important centre of operations.

In the war carried on between Venusius and his wife, Cartis-

mandua, the queen was aided by the Romans, and the husband by his allies and a considerable number of the Brigantes. A great battle ensued, and Venusius and his Britons were defeated. About the same time the Britons suffered another defeat by the Romans under Cæsius Nasica. Didius was recalled in the year 57 or 58, and was succeeded by Veranius, who lived only a year, during which he gained some victories over the Silures. The narrative has now reached an important point. The Romans had gained and lost several battles, and the condition of affairs was not very satisfactory from a Roman point of view. A strong man was required in order to overcome the powerful and continued resistance of the brave Britons. The skilful general, Suetonius Paullinus, was appointed to the command. He entered upon his task in the year 59 A.D. His reputation, according to Tacitus, was then very high, and his operations in Britain showed that he was able, unscrupulous, and cruel.

In the early part of Paullinus's campaign he seemed to have been successful, and in all probability subdued the Silures as the most powerful of the British tribes, and completed the occupation of their country and the region of the Severn. We have, however, no detailed account of his early operations. He was at the head of a strong army, which consisted of four legions—the second, the ninth, the fourteenth, and the twentieth. These legions were stationed in different parts of the country. The headquarters of the second legion were on the Severn and the Wye, comprehending Monmouthshire and Gloucestershire, having Caerleon, or the fortress of the legion, as the centre. The ninth legion was stationed in the eastern part of the country, among the Iceni. The twentieth legion was located somewhere on the borders of the Brigantes, and probably having charge of the city of Diva, or Chester, and the district between it and the north. The fourteenth legion was under the special command of Paullinus himself. The Silures having been subdued, Paullinus was at liberty to advance to the conquest of the isle of Mona, or Anglesey. This island had become the chief seat of the Druids in Britain. It was the conviction of the Romans that the Druids were the great enemies of the Roman power, and the instigators of the resistance to the Roman army, especially of the Silures, the Ordovices, and their allies. Paullinus determined to conquer Mona, and destroy the power of the Druids. He therefore marched to Menai Straits.

When the Roman army arrived at the straits, they saw on the Mona side large numbers of armed men lining the shore, and women dressed in black, their hair streaming in the wind, and with torches in their hands, running like furies along the ranks. Around were the Druids, uttering dreadful prayers and imprecations, with hands spread towards heaven. The effect on the minds of the Roman soldiers was at first great and caused dismay. They soon, however, recovered themselves, and, under the exhortations of their general, resolved not to fear an army of women and fanatics, and prepared to cross over the straits—the infantry in flat-bottomed

boats, the cavalry by the ford, or by swimming. In all probability the strait was not then as deep as it is now. There is now no ford, and the channel is deep and the tide strong. The soldiers, however, soon crossed, and rushed upon the Britons, who were probably only a feeble body. The Druids were all slaughtered, and thrown into the flames of their own altars. Such is in substance the account given by Tacitus. The Druids were destroyed, and do not appear to have been afterwards of much consequence. They survived in other parts of Britain, but ceased to be the controlling power among the people. Their destruction was shockingly cruel, but the Romans were commonly cruel. It has been thought by some writers that the destruction of the Druids was a preparation for the establishment of Christianity among the Britons. These events in Mona probably occurred in the year A.D. 60.

The most important events after the destruction of the Druids was the war against the Iceni of the eastern districts, of whom Boadicea was the renowned queen. The Britons were treated with the greatest harshness, and continually robbed of their property by the Roman officials. The native chiefs, or kings, were formerly allowed to govern their tribes, and keep their property, subject to Roman supremacy and the payment of the tribute. Now, however, when a Nero reigned in Rome, every kind of licence was practised on the Britons, on chiefs and people by the uncontrolled power of the Roman officials. Their houses were entered and pillaged, and their women were dishonoured. This treatment produced the greatest excitement and spirit of revenge, and led to a terrible and destructive war against the Roman oppressors. The excitement came to a crisis amongst the Iceni. Prasutagus, king of the Iceni, died. He was a rich man, and in order, as he thought, to conciliate his Roman masters, he had bequeathed in his will that the Roman emperor should have one part of his property, and his two daughters the other part. Soon after his death, the Roman officers took possession of his kingdom as a conquered province, and seized all his property. The property of the nobles and of the common people was also taken possession of. The palace itself was plundered. The widowed queen, Boadicea, was scourged, her two daughters were violated, and the relatives of the royal family were cast into prison, or even sold as slaves.

These outrages led to war. Boadicea appealed to her people. The Iceni flew to arms, and they were joined by the Trinobantes, who occupied the district now known as Essex. A war thus excited by strong passions would be a destructive one. Such was the case. The city of Camulodunum (Colchester) was then the centre of the Roman power, and its inhabitants consisted largely of veteran Roman soldiers, who had been guilty of every kind of oppression, robbery, and cruelty. The city then had not been fortified, the inhabitants thinking most of plunder and luxury. The native army first attacked and captured this city.

The colonists fled to the Temple of Claudius, the strongest place in the city. Here they stood a siege of two days and were then overpowered and slain. The Roman garrison was not large, and could not stand the vigorous onslaught of the Britons. The ninth legion, under Petilius Cerealis, was in camp in the district of the Trinobantes, over Essex and part of Middlesex, and Cerealis was summoned to the aid of the garrison, but arrived too late. He, however, attacked the triumphant Britons, and was totally defeated. The infantry of the legion was nearly destroyed, and the cavalry, with Cerealis, escaped to the camp, and there fortified themselves. The procurator, or civil governor, Catus, to whose rapacity and cruelty the revolt was mainly due, managed to escape, and fled to Gaul. Thus the eastern part of the country was lost to the Romans, and the entire province of Britain was in danger, and would have followed in the wake, but for the skill and great energy of Suetonius Paullinus.

On learning the serious state of affairs in the east, Paullinus, after the destruction of the Druids of Mona and the subjugation of the west, hastened to the scene of operations. He collected all the forces he could ; his own fourteenth legion he had under his own command, the twentieth legion, stationed on the borders of the Brigantes of Lancashire, also was ordered to join him. The second legion, stationed in the district of the Severn, perhaps from Caerleon to Gloucester and Cirencester, was unable to join him, owing to the cowardice of the commander, according to the historians, but probably because of difficulties in the condition of the country. The troops under Paullinus were about 10,000. These were augmented by others, and the fragment of the ninth legion which had escaped from the slaughter after the capture of Camulodunum. These forces amounted to, perhaps, about 20,000, most of them disciplined and hardened soldiers. Paullinus at first intended to march upon Londinium, or London, and make it his headquarters ; but he changed his plans, and left it to its fate. The Britons attacked Londinium, and destroyed it ; took all it contained of value, and slaughtered its Roman inhabitants. The same fate befel the city of Verulam, the modern St. Albans. In such excitement and war of races no mercy was shown, but prisoners were slaughtered on both sides. The arrival of Paullinus on the scene led to the most destructive part of the war. The British troops were collected, and Boadicea addressed them in the most spirited manner. A great battle took place in a position selected. The Britons were numerous and confident, and had brought their women in wagons, placed behind the army, to witness the expected defeat of the Romans. The historian Dio Cassius states that the Britons were 120,000 in number ; doubtless a great exaggeration. The Roman army was placed so as to have a hill on either side and a forest behind. The heavy armed infantry were in the centre ; the light troops were on the flanks, and the cavalry in front. Boadicea, with her daughters, was in a chariot, going round the various tribal forces, encouraging them with

eloquent words and expressive gestures. Her countenance was fierce, the tones of her voice were deep ; her red, luxurious hair fell to her hips. A chain of gold was around her neck, and a bright tunic and a military cloak covered her body, and a spear was in her right hand. The historian placed on her lips an eloquent address on the curse of slavery and the blessings of liberty, and the wrongs they had suffered from the Romans, and encouraged them that, if they were men, and brave, their numbers would ensure them victory.

The battle came on, was fought with desperation on both sides, and the victory belonged, not to the bravest, but to the most skilful and disciplined. The Romans advanced against the Britons, and poured their missiles into the crowded ranks of their opponents ; then, like a wedge, pushed through the Britons, followed by the light-armed troops and the cavalry. The Britons were defeated and fled. The massacre was awful ; men, women, and cattle were slain without discrimination. The killed and wounded are given in round numbers—the Romans as under 1,000, and the Britons 80,000. The number of the Britons described as slain in this battle probably denotes their loss during the whole insurrection. In this rebellion the Romans lost altogether 70,000, according to the accounts which have come down to us, and the Britons 80,000. The result of this battle was decisive, and the entire country of the Iceni and their allies was subdued. Boadicea preferred death to life, and committed suicide. The entire country was overrun, plundered, and the inhabitants slain. Suetonius Paullinus was cruel and unrelenting, and gave no encouragement to submission on the part of the Britons, a good illustration of his master, the Emperor Nero, who had appointed him. The war continued feebly for some time longer, but the great battle described practically ended the insurrection, and secured the subjugation of the Britons in the east and adjoining districts. This battle took place in the year A.D. 61.

Then followed a period of comparative peace for about ten years. The cruelty of Paullinus was not approved of by some of the Romans. The new civil governor, Julius Classicianus, who had been sent as the successor to Catus, was more merciful, and disputed the policy of Paullinus. The civil and the military authorities were thus at variance, and a new agent (Polyclitus) was sent from Rome to arrange the dispute, and report on the condition of the country. His report was against Paullinus, who was recalled at the end of 61. During the quiet of the ten years following, there was a succession of commanders, whose aims seemed to be to consolidate the districts which had been conquered. The Roman troops were even reduced. The fourteenth legion was removed to Italy, and many of the veterans of the three legions that remained were withdrawn. Vespasian was now settled on the imperial throne, and he sent Cerealis, a relative of his own, as the commander in Britain. This was in A.D. 71. This com-

mander carried on war with the Brigantes, and gained some of their extensive territory. He was succeeded by Julius Frontinus. This commander carried on a war with the Silures, who, in their mountains, had maintained their independence. He, however, conquered them in battle, but soon was recalled. A new stage was now entered upon, which extended further the conquests of the Romans.

CHAPTER IX

A.D. 78—410

THE BRITONS AND THE ROMANS UNDER AGRICOLA AND HIS SUCCESSORS

The new commander appointed by Vespasian in the year A.D. 78 was Julius Agricola, a great soldier and a wise and able administrator. He was well acquainted with Britain, having been an officer under Paullinus, and was present in the war against Mona, and the dreadful conflicts with the Iceni under Boadicea. After these conflicts he left Britain and served the emperor in Gaul, and afterwards as consul in Rome. He was in Britain in A.D. 70 as commander of the twentieth legion, when Bolanus and Cerealis were governors. Now he was appointed to the chief command, and arrived in Britain in the summer of the year 78. The state of affairs was unsatisfactory to the Roman authorities. The Roman arms had recently made no progress, and had suffered some reverses. The powerful tribe known as the Ordovices, who formed the chief people of North Wales, had destroyed a force of Roman cavalry. The imperial power, therefore, needed a new man of energy, and this was found in Agricola, whose deeds have been eloquently described by Tacitus, his son-in-law, in his Life of Agricola. He lost no time in commencing the campaign. He gathered all the forces he could, formed his plans, and in the autumn of the year he marched against the Ordovices. He found them in position in the mountains, intending to act on the defensive. Agricola determined to attack them, and the battle was fought in those mountains, whose precise locality has not been described. The result was the defeat and almost the destruction of the whole tribe, that is, the portion engaged in the battle. Then he resolved to cross over the Menai Straits and conquer the isle of Mona, the same straits crossed eighteen years previously by the Romans under Paullinus, when the Druids were destroyed and the island subdued for the time being. The Romans now resolved to cross without any boats. The order was given that they were to cross by swimming, as many of the auxiliaries from Germany were skilful swimmers. The order was obeyed, and they succeeded in crossing. The straits then were probably not as broad and deep as now, as has been previously remarked. The Britons were not

prepared for this unusual movement, and made no effectual resistance, and surrendered. Their numbers were probably few, and, if they had been disposed to resist, they would have had no chance.

This terminated the campaign of the first year, and the winter was near. Agricola remained quiet during the winter. In the following year, 79, the Roman troops were employed in subduing those natives who continued to oppose, but no great battle took place. Agricola was a statesman as well as a soldier, and a wise administrator. He clearly perceived that the wisest policy was to conciliate the natives by just measures. His son-in law and biographer, the renowned Tacitus, observes that : " Well acquainted with the temper of the province, and taught by the experience of former governors how little proficiency had been made by arms, when success was followed by injuries, he next undertook to eradicate the causes of war " (Life of Agricola, 19). He commenced to place restrictions on all his officials, including his own household. " He suffered no public business to pass through the hands of his slaves or freedmen." He appointed his officers, not by favour, but by merit, and many gross abuses in the government by which the inhabitants suffered were abolished. The adoption of this wise policy led to beneficial results. The Britons were pacified, and began to adopt the habits and the customs of the Romans, and the young nobles to learn Latin and to acquire Roman learning, showing, according to Tacitus, a superiority in mental power over the Gauls. Indeed, it is evident from Roman descriptions that they had a higher conception of the skill and abilities of the Britons than of many other peoples, though they called them barbarians. In course of time the Britons adopted the dress and manners of the Romans, and even their luxuries and pleasures.

Having largely pacified the southern portions of the country, Agricola prepared in 79 to march in the direction of the north, and two years were spent in the expedition to Scotland, and he extended the Roman dominion over the lowlands of Scotland. And, to strengthen the Roman hold over the country, Agricola constructed a chain of forts between the estuaries of the Forth and the Clyde. This was completed by the close of the year A.D. 81. In the next year, 82, Agricola began his fifth campaign, against the district of Galloway, opposite Ireland, as a preliminary to the contemplated conquest of Ireland. The sixth campaign, in the year A.D. 83, was directed against the northern tribes beyond the boundary previously established. The Roman navy assisted in the campaign, proceeding into the waters of Scotland. Advancing gradually northward, Agricola met the confederated Caledonians, under the command of Galgacus, to the number of 30,000. A great battle took place near the Grampians, at the place generally considered as Murdoch Moor. The battle ended with the defeat of the Caledonians, and the loss of one third of their number. The Romans lost 360, and only one officer of rank. The short targets and pointless swords used by the

Caledonians were wholly inefficient in a hand-to-hand encounter. Then Agricola led his troops into the territory of the Horestii, from whom he obtained hostages, and then retired; and brought his military career in Britain to an end, for he was recalled, and left Britain in the year 84.

It was some time during Agricola's command that the city of York, or Eboracum, was first occupied by a Roman legion, in the year 80, or 81. The people of Britain were not only conquered by Agricola, but they were largely pacified, and gave no further trouble of any consequence to the Romans. The troubles that did arise came from the Caledonians of the north.

For thirty years after the departure of Agricola, the Roman legions had little or nothing to do in Britain, and the country claimed but little of the attention of the imperial government. The successor of Agricola was Sallustius Lucullus, who was put to death by the Emperor Domitian for the trifling offence of giving his own name to a new pattern for a spearhead. During this period Caledonia was practically independent. In the year A.D. 120, Hadrian came to Britain, and his first task was to put down some small insurrections. The Caledonians of the north, however, gave much trouble by their incursions. To arrest the progress of these powerful tribes, an earthern rampart, or wall, was constructed from the Tyne to the Solway Firth, across the country at its narrowest part. It consisted of a stone wall, a ditch, and an earthern rampart, and castles and towers. Such a work could not be completed in a short time. It appears that the work went on for more than eighty years, beginning in 120, and probably completed in 207 A.D. The wall was 73½ miles in length. There were buildings erected on it for the accommodation and defence of the troops: camps, at intervals of four miles, castles at intervals of a Roman mile, and also watch-towers. There were also roads: a military road, twenty feet wide along the whole length of the wall, and another road for general purposes. In the year 139, the successor of Hadrian, the Emperor Antoninus Pius, who became emperor the preceding year, sent to Britain Lollius Urbicus for the purpose of subduing a portion of the great tribe of the Brigantes, who rose in arms against the Romans. He also succeeded in extending the boundary of the British province northward; and, to protect the southern province, which we now know as England, he constructed another wall, or defence, which extended from the Firth of Forth to the Firth of Clyde, and thereby joined the forts erected about sixty years before by Agricola. This boundary line was called the wall of Antoninus—the *Vallum Antonini*. It was begun in the year 140, and completed in 145. This general continued as commander in Britain for twenty years, and extended the Roman dominion as far as the Moray Firth.

Of the next fifty years of Romano-British history very little is known. In the year 184, General Nepius Marcellus being in command of Britain, there was an invasion of some of the northern tribes, which was repelled with some difficulty. Clodius

Albinus succeeded Marcellus as governor of Britain. He was considered so important a man that the Emperor Commodus offered him the title of Cæsar, which was equivalent to vice-emperor, with the right of succession to the throne. Albinus, however, declined the proposal. This offended the emperor, and he superseded him; but he maintained his position, in spite of the emperor. The Emperor Severus, who came to the throne in the year 193. offered Albinus the title, which he accepted. There was, however, no sincerity in the proposal. The emperor was jealous of him, and formed a plot for his assassination, which failed. This led to a quarrel. Albinus crossed over to the continent with a part of his army and encountered Severus, and a battle was fought between them somewhere near the town of Lugdunum, or Leyden, in Holland. Albinus was defeated and put to death.

The Caledonians continued to be very troublesome to the Romans, and, to put an end to their incursions, the Emperor Severus was induced to visit Britain, in the year A.D. 208, accompanied by his two sons, Caracalla and Geta. He marched to the north, and proceeded to nearly the extremity of the country, amidst many difficulties and hardships, driving the Caledonians before him. The Caledonians finally sued for peace and gave up some of their territory. Then Severus retired to the south, having gained nothing, in reality, and lost by war and hardships 50,000 men. Severus, having suffered much during the northern campaign, retired to Eboracum, or York. The northern tribes again rebelled against the Roman power, as soon as the army had retired. Severus became angry at this want of faith, and swore that he would exterminate them. He was, however, unable to carry out his cruel purpose. He was then suffering from serious disease contracted, or aggravated, during the recent expedition. He died, however, at York in the year 210 or 211. His son made peace with the northern enemy, and thus ended the war for the time. The campaign of Severus was fruitless. The only monument of his activity was the erection of another wall to strengthen that of Antoninus, the Vallum Antonini.

From the death of Severus at York during the greater part of the third century, nothing of great importance took place between the Britons and the Romans. It was a period of internal discord in the empire and in Britain. Pretenders to the imperial throne arose in different parts of the empire. These men in subsequent time were designated the "thirty Tyrants," in imitation of the original tyrants who governed Athens about the fourth century before our era. This state of things extended to Gaul and to Britain, and necessarily distracted the attention of the central Roman authority, and prevented any fresh expeditions in the south or the north. The Roman government, however, in Britain was continued under more favourable conditions, and Roman civilisation was gradually extended to the interior of the country. In this period Britain was troubled and harassed by the frequent invasions of freebooters and pirates, who issued from the North Seas and

the Baltic. They were the early comers of the swarms of pirates who, for several ages, invaded the western and the northern parts of Europe, and ultimately became a power which changed the condition of political and social life of several countries, including Gaul and Britain. They bore different names at different times: Normans, or Northmen, Franks, Danes, and Saxons. In Britain they were generally known as Saxon pirates. They invaded the southern and the eastern shores of Britain. To protect the coasts against these rovers the Roman emperors appointed an officer, under the name of "Comes Littoris Saxonici," or, the Count of the Saxon shore, by which designation we must understand the shore usually invaded by the Saxon pirates. The shore thus invaded included the Gallic as well as the British coasts. This Roman officer had his headquarters in the place now known as Boulogne. This officer had placed under him a fleet, in order that he might pursue and destroy the ships of the pirates.

The power given to this officer was considerable, and in times of disorder and violation of discipline offered temptation to assume an independent position. In all probability the first person to hold this position was a native of Holland, whose name was Carausius. Some say that he was of British extraction. He was ambitious, and, although he had risen from the ranks, he was not satisfied with his position, and asserted his own supremacy; and it has been asserted that he even formed an alliance with the Saxon pirates themselves, in order to secure his supremacy. His power became so great that the Emperor Maximilian was led to recognise his supremacy. He was for some years allowed by the emperors to have his own way. His rebellion was evident, and in A.D. 287 he became independent, and Britain was nominally separated from Rome. In the year 291 Constantius was raised to the rank of Cæsar, and he made an attempt to restore Britain to the empire. He secured the harbour of Boulogne, and attempted to cross over to Britain in the following year, but failed through stormy weather. In the year 293, Carausius was murdered by Allectus, who maintained his own independent power in Britain for three years. In the year 297, Constantius again made an attempt to cross over the Channel and capture Britain, and he was successful. The expedition was divided into two parts, one under Asclepiodotus and the other under Constantius himself. The fleet of Allectus was placed near to the Isle of Wight, or Vectis, to intercept the expedition of Constantius. The two parts of the fleet succeeded in evading Allectus, and the forces were landed in Britain, and Allectus was defeated, fled, and was slain. Thus Britain was again restored to the empire. Constantius spent the remainder of his life in Britain, and died at York, in the year 306, or 310. He was known as Constantius Chlorus, and he was the father of Constantine the Great, by his wife Helena, who was probably a native of Antioch, not of Britain, as some have contended. After the death of Constantius, his son, Constantine, known afterwards in history as Constantine the Great,

was proclaimed Augustus, and a few years after became the Roman emperor—the first Christian emperor.

The Romans continued to hold Britain for a hundred years longer, but very little has been recorded of the events in the country during that period. The Britons themselves were quiet. The disturbances that did occur came from ambitious Roman soldiers, or from the incursions of the Picts and the Scots, and also the Saxon pirates. It is certain that during this period of comparative internal quietude the Britons made much progress in all the arts of peace, and became a prosperous people. The Roman emperors were too much engaged in their own affairs to pay much attention to Britain, or to render much assistance. The Roman legions were gradually withdrawn from Britain, and, finally, in the year 410, Britain was abandoned, after about four hundred years of Roman rule.

CHAPTER X

THE ROMAN OCCUPATION

MANY opinions may possibly be entertained in relation to the results of the Roman conquest and occupation. Some may paint in exaggerated colours the beneficial results of the higher civilisation of the Romans on the barbarous peoples of ancient Britain. Others may go to the other extreme, and can see nothing but evil in the Roman occupation. The truth in this case is the medium between extremes. That the Romans were, for the age of the world, a great, civilised power can hardly be doubted; and that they introduced into Gaul and Britain many important elements of civilisation is quite certain. They were, however, a very cruel people, and their punishments were extremely brutal. The ancient Britons were not the barbarians which the Romans declared them to be, and which some modern historians represent them. The Romans found them to be a very brave and intelligent people. If they had possessed the best weapons of war, such as the Romans had, and had been a united people, not broken up into discordant tribes, they would probably not have been conquered, even by the Romans. The same truth is exemplified even in modern times. The greatest victories of recent times have been gained by the best weapons, and the greatest national unity. If the Romans had never conquered, occupied, and governed Britain, there is no reason to suppose that the Britons themselves would have remained in the condition in which they were nineteen centuries ago. Such an energetic, brave, and intelligent people would have acquired the elements of a higher civilisation, and would have pushed themselves onwards.

And yet it must be admitted that the Roman occupation of nearly four hundred years did serve an important purpose in the progressive development of the British people. They introduced many arts and trades and refinements of life. Better houses were constructed; towns, in the modern sense of the word, were erected, some on British sites, very different from the mud huts of British villages placed in the centre of woods or forests. Roads and bridges were made, connecting one part of the country with another, such as were beyond the power of the Britons themselves. The Romans were a bridge-making people, and, though some of

their roads were made along ancient British tracks, there never were such extensive and methodical and convenient roads as those made by the Romans, from the extreme south to the west, the east, and the north. They also did much to reclaim land from the sea, and they promoted agriculture by the establishment of agricultural colonies, and by better methods of cultivation. The ancient Britons were not as deficient in their agricultural knowledge as some historians have represented; but the Romans contributed considerably to the improved methods of cultivating the land, and they introduced new plants and trees. They specially promoted the cultivation of corn; not that corn cultivation was unknown among the Britons, but the Romans promoted it to such a degree that in the fourth century large quantities of corn were exported to supply the Roman fortresses on the Rhine.

The Romans had established manufactures in Britain. Roman pottery was largely made, as is evident from the large quantities found in the ruins of houses and towns, and in districts where the manufactures were carried on. The specimens which have been unearthed in modern times, and the numerous broken fragments found in various places, show that the art was in an advanced condition during the Roman occupation. Glass was also made during this period, introduced by the Romans. In this manufacture much skill was exhibited by the workers. The manufactures in metals were also promoted, and attained a considerable degree of maturity. In prehistoric times tin was largely produced by the Britons, and ironworks were established. The Romans did not originate these, but merely improved them. Lead and copper were produced in large quantities, and used in manufactures. Bronze was in common use in the manufacture of useful and ornamental articles. Gold and silver in small quantities were found. The art of medicine existed among the Britons, though not introduced by the Romans. Among the remains of this period discovered are Roman stamps containing the names of the makers and the medical purposes of the preparations. During the Roman occupation of nearly four centuries much improvement in the condition of the inhabitants had taken place, due in part to the Romans, and in part to the native intelligence of the Britons themselves.

The whole of Britain was only nominally under the government of the Romans. The tribes of the north, or Scotland, had been defeated in many battles, but never subdued, and brought under Roman control. The Caledonians and the other northern tribes maintained their independence. The most distant parts of the west, now called Wales, were never entirely subjugated by the Romans. A Roman legion was stationed at Deva, or Chester, to guard the country against the incursions of the tribes of North Wales; and another legion, the famous second, was placed at Caerleon, near our Newport, in Monmouthshire, to protect the Roman possessions against the Silures and the other tribes of South Wales, as well as to supply garrisons for the important fortress of Corinium, or Cirencester, and Glevum or Gloucester. The

hold of the Romans on these distant parts of the country was, however, very imperfect.

The country was denominated the Province, being treated as a province of the Roman empire; but, in course of time, it was divided into five parts, or sub-provinces. From the time of the Emperor Severus, Britain was divided into Upper and Lower Britain. Probably Upper Britain consisted of the territory of the west and south-west; and the Lower Britain contained the northern and eastern districts, of which York was the centre. At a subsequent time, the time of Diocletian and Constantine the Great, the two divisions were again sub-divided. Upper Britain became Britannia Prima and Secunda, and Lower Britain, Maxima Cæsariensis and Flavia Cæsariensis. In the year 369 the district between the two walls, that of Hadrian and that of Antoninus, was constituted a separate division under the name of Valentia. The five sub-provinces in the order of dignity were thus arranged: Maxima Cæsariensis, embracing much of the north, Yorkshire as the centre; Valentia, lying, as stated, between the two walls; Britannia Prima, extending from our Cornwall and including the country south of the Thames and Bristol Channel; Britannia Secunda, including the district of the Severn and Wales, and adjoining districts; then, finally, Flavia Cæsariensis, comprehending roughly what we call the Midlands and the eastern counties. The chief officers over the first and second of these divisions were of the rank of consuls, and those of the others Presidents (Præsides). The whole country was under the government of one Roman officer, called the Vice-Prefect, or Vicar. He, again, was under the authority of the Pretorian Prefect of Gaul. The Vice-Prefect was the civil governor, and had the management of the finances and the administration of justice. The military power was vested in three officers, designated the Count of Britain, the Count of the Saxon Shore, as previously described, and the Duke of the Britons. The power of the first probably extended over the entire country; that of the second to the shore harassed by the Saxons; and the last was limited to Upper Britain, though not always so.

During the Roman occupation of nearly four centuries, many important towns came into existence, some of them on ancient British sites. The city of London was a British town anterior to the Romans. Its name is British, derived from *dun*, a fort, and *llyn*, a lake, or pool, meaning the fort, or fortified town, on the lake, or the waters. The site of London was then a marsh, full of streams flowing into the Thames, whose banks were not enclosed and extended farther into the land. Under the Romans it became a more important place. They tried to change its name into *Augusta;* but its British name has survived to the present day, the name of the greatest and most important city in the world. The towns of Verulamium, or St. Albans, and Camulodunum, or Colchester, were built by the Britons, in the early period of the Roman occupation, on old British villages, or fortified positions. Rutupiæ, or Rich-

borough, was an important port in Kent, the place where visitors landed. Darvernum, or Durovernum, was the name of the city of Canterbury, which became a town of importance under the Romans. Venta Belgarum, or Caer Gwent, became the important town of Winchester. Aquæ Calidæ, meaning warm waters, became the noted city of Bath, known to the ancient Britons as a place of healing waters, but constituted into a regular place of baths by the Romans. Dubræ became the important town of Dover, whose white chalk rocks were a prominent object when the Roman ships passed by on their way to the landing port of Rutupiæ. The ancient Lindum became the city of Lincoln, where was established a Roman colony. The British Evrauc was transformed into Eboracum, and then into York. The primitive village was converted into the principal city for the Romans in the north, the important and historical city of York.

The British Caer Gloui became the Roman Glevum, and the modern Gloucester; and Caer Cori, the Roman Corinium, and the modern Cirencester. The *Isca* was the Romanised form of the British Esk, meaning water: hence Exeter, the town established on the Roman station by the river, and the great headquarters of the second legion in Monmouthshire, Isca, on the river Usk, then Isca Silurian, and finally Caerleon, the city, or fortress, of the legion. The British Deva became the site of a Roman camp for a legion, and was afterwards known as Caerleon, the modern Chester. The same word, caer, forms part of the names of several towns, such as Carlisle, the ancient British Luguvallium. The term caer denotes a fortress, and is the equivalent of the Roman castrum. Some contend it is the British rendering of the Roman castrum, but others, more correctly, that it is an original British word having a meaning similar to the Roman *castrum*.

We cannot describe here all the towns which owed their existence, or their reconstruction to the Romans. Two of those mentioned, namely, Verulamium, near St. Albans, and Eboracum, or York, were municipal towns (municipia) possessed of the Roman privileges of citizens in the highest degree. Nine of them were Roman colonies (coloniæ) whose privileges ultimately were nearly the same as the municipia. These were, to use the modern names, London, Colchester, Richborough, Bath, Caerleon, Chester, Gloucester, Lincoln, and Cambridge. Ten towns, or cities, were governed under the Latin law, *civitates Latio jure donatæ*. These had privileges, not so great as the colonies or the municipia, but modifications of them. These towns were Castor, Catterick, Slack, Ribchester, Carlisle, Burghead, Dealgin Ross, Dumbarton, Cirencester, Old Sarum. There were also twelve stipendiary towns of less consequence. The inhabitants of these towns had to pay their taxes in money, instead of a portion of the produce of the land. These towns were Caerwent, in Monmouthshire, then called Venta Silurum; Winchester, Caistor, in Norfolk; Segontium, Caernarvon, Leicester, Canterbury, Dorchester, Exeter, Riechester, Rochester, and Seaton. These towns number altogether thirty-

three. They consisted of the town and much land around it. They had all, more or less, the privileges of Roman citizens, and they were far from the control of the imperial officers. They had the privilege of self-government, subject to subordination to the empire and the discharge of certain duties, including their own defence as a part of the empire. Many of the citizens of these towns were old Roman soldiers. When their term of service expired, they remained behind and had land given them, and became Roman colonists, and the inhabitants of the towns described above.

The Roman legions in course of time came to be made up, not as formerly, of Romans purely, but of soldiers of all the countries which had been conquered. These were largely the auxiliaries of the legions, equal in number to the legions themselves. The towns described and the colonies, we know from various sources, and especially from the Roman document called the *Notitia Imperii*, composed at the end of the fourth century, were made up of a great variety of nationalities, such as the following:—Sarmatians, Tungrians, Spaniards, various tribes of Belgians, men from Portugal, Batavians, Dacians, Gauls of different tribes, and many descriptions of Germans, besides Romans proper. These different peoples, under Roman government and law and discipline, constituted the inhabitants of the thirty-three towns scattered over Britain and the surrounding districts. When they arrived in Britain they were not accompanied by wives. They married the women of the country—native British women. After the close of the destructive wars of the first century of the occupation, the Romans and the Britons lived together in comparative peace. There was probably no love between them, but external agreement. The result of intermarriages was a mixed population having Roman fathers and British mothers. Then, as time advanced, the children of these intermarriages married among themselves. In the course of three hundred years a large Romano-British population would come into existence, and when the Roman legions left, in the beginning of the fifth century, nearly all these persons would be left behind, and would gradually be fused with the Britons. The precise number of this population cannot be determined. They must have been tens of thousands. Some historians have approximately estimated them at 200,000. By this mixture of races the inhabitants of Britain became less purely Celtic. The Roman element, however, gradually lost its distinctive peculiarities, and became identified with the general British population.

The language of official life during the Roman occupation was Latin. This also was the spoken and written tongue of the town population and their immediate neighbourhoods. And it is probable that the native chiefs and their families largely understood and spoke Latin. The Romans established in Britain schools, not only for the inhabitants of the towns, but also for the education of the best families of the Britons. We find that, long after the departure of the Romans, the educated portion of the Britons wrote their books in the Latin language.

CHAPTER XI

THE INTRODUCTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIANITY IN BRITAIN

The precise time when Christianity was introduced into Britain has been a matter of controversy. There is no history that gives details of the time and the manner of its introduction. The knowledge of its coming to the Anglo-Saxons by Augustine and his companions we learn from definite history, but this occurred several centuries after the former event. In the course of ecclesiastical controversies the two introductions are sometimes confounded, and the ancient British church is treated as if it were a branch of the English church established by Augustine and others. This has created much confusion in the popular mind. The genuine historian, of course, has not been deluded by the tricks of mere partizans. The ancient British church did not owe its existence to the agency of the Roman church ; it never was connected with that church, and was entirely independent of it. It was not until the middle ages, in the time of the Anglo-Saxon supremacy, that the Welsh church was induced to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome and the authority of Canterbury.

Some able historians have contended that Christianity was brought to Britain in the Apostolic age, and that St. Paul preached here. The mention in the New Testament that he intended to travel to Spain, and St. Clement's declaration: "St. Paul went to the extreme limit of the west in his missionary journeys," have led some to contend that as Britain is a very westerly country, he must have been here. The late Canon Lysons, of Gloucester, maintained that he came to Britain and even to Gloucester, which was then an important Roman centre in this country, and even preached on the site of the Gloucester cathedral. There is really no positive historical evidence for the opinion expressed. There are, however, some striking coincidences of names on which the opinion is founded. In 2 Timothy iv. 21, the names of Pudens and Claudia are mentioned. In the work of Martial, of the same age, he mentions that a British lady of the name of Claudia was married to a Pudens, of the family of Caractacus, then a prisoner in Rome. This Claudia is described as a Christian and of British origin. It has been suggested, even by Dean Alford, that this Claudia became a Christian through her connection with Pomponia, the wife of Aulus

Plautius, the Roman commander in Britain, who was accused, according to Tacitus, of having embraced a "foreign superstition," meaning the Christian religion. The language of Martial, writing in reference to Claudia's marriage with Pudens, is thus :—

> Our Claudia, true Roman, though she springs
> From a long line of Britain's painted kings ;
> Italia's self might claim so fair a face,
> And Athens envy her matchless grace.

These names seem to show that about the middle of the first century there were Christians in Britain. The argument seems plausible, but it rests on the assumption that the Pudens and Claudia of 2 Timothy and those of Martial were the same. There is, however, no evidence for this. The names mentioned were very common then among the Romans. The contention is, however, a mere theory not sustained by facts.

In the traditionary accounts framed several centuries afterwards, the introduction of Christianity into Britain has, according to Haddon and Stubbs, in their "Concilia," been ascribed to ten or more persons, namely, Bran, the supposed father of Caradoc ; St. Paul, as previously described ; St. Peter, St. Simon Zelotes, St. Philip, St. James, the great ; St. John ; Aristobulus, the Arwystli Hen of the Triads ; Joseph of Arimathea, and the missionaries sent by Eleutherius, the bishop of Rome in the second century, in response to a letter from Lucius, king of Britain. These accounts are generally regarded as mythical, and rest upon no historical evidence. It is very doubtful whether there ever was a king of Britain of the name of Lucius. Certainly, in the time of the Roman occupation there could not have been a king of *Britain*. There were chiefs of tribes under the Roman domination, but no king of Britain. These varied accounts were constructed in after ages, out of certain slender materials, and embodied in the native works of Bæda, Nennius, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the Triads. They are certainly not historical, and may be safely laid aside in any work that professes to be genuine history.

Although we have no trustworthy historical evidence to determine the precise date of the introduction of Christianity into Britain, and the agency by which it was brought here, we know that it must have come here by some agency during the Roman occupation. It is certain that early British Christianity had no connection with the Roman, or western church. Its character indicated a connection, more or less, with the eastern church rather than the western. This appears evident from its celebration of Easter. In the absence of definite historical evidence, we can proceed only on the ground of probability, that is, judging from certain known facts to probable conclusions. It is probable that Christianity was introduced here at an early period, not by any missionary agency of any church, but by the intercourse of Britons with eastern churches. In the second century there was considerable traffic between the Britons and the Gauls residing in the

south, at Lyons and Marseilles, and on the shores of the Mediterranean. We know that in those districts there were Christian churches of importance in the second century, and that their Christianity was of the oriental type. The distinguished presbyter and bishop, Irenæus, was the pastor of the church at Lyons at this time, and he showed his relation to the church at Ephesus and the Apostle John. The Britons in all probability were made acquainted with the Christian religion by their visits to this region of Gaul.

In the second century they were to a large extent without a religion. The Romans had destroyed the headquarters of Druidism in Anglesey; and, though we have no reason to suppose that the system was entirely dead through the country, it had lost its power and vitality. The Britons, who have always been a religious people, were thus prepared to receive a new religion, and Christianity commended itself to their minds and hearts. The churches at Marseilles and Lyons and Vienne owed their existence to the Greeks, and they possessed the characteristics of the Greek churches generally, and the early church of Britain partook of their spirit. There seemed for several ages a close connection between the Gallic and the British churches. Britain under the Romans was regarded as a province under the wider province of Gaul, and the intercourse was considerable in the second century. The early Gallic churches may not have organised regular missionary agencies for the evangelisation of the Britons. The work was probably done by individuals. Britons went to the south of Gaul on business, and Gauls from the same district came to Britain. The language spoken by both peoples was essentially the same, and intercourse would consequently be easy. The language of the earliest churches of Gaul was no doubt Greek, but the Greek Christians would know and also speak the language of the country, the Celtic.

The direct evidence for the existence of a Christian church in Britain in the second century is not very extensive, but seems positive. The great Christian father, Tertullian, who flourished in the beginning of the third century, thus refers to Britain in his "Ad Judæos," or "Answer to the Jews," describing the nations who had believed in Christ, mentions: "The diverse nations of the Gauls and the haunts of the Britons, inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ" (ch. vii., Clark's translation). This seems to indicate that Christianity had penetrated to the interior of Britain, which probably was beyond the reach of the legions in the time of Severus. This book was written in the fifteenth year of the Emperor Severus, estimated to be the year A.D. 207 or 208. The learned Origen of Alexandria, writing probably in the year 239, in his Homily IV., asks the question: "When has Britain before the arrival of Christ assented to the religious belief in one God?" In Homily VI. he shows that the Gospel had penetrated to Britain, though separated so much from the rest of the globe. The language

may be considered rhetorical, but it would have no meaning, except on the supposition that Britain had accepted Christianity.

The testimony of Eusebius, the great church historian, is not very definite. Speaking of the activity of the early disciples and apostles, he represents some of them as "reaching the extremities of the inhabited world, and that others crossed the ocean to the isles called Britannic." The language implies that in his time, beginning of the fourth century, it was commonly understood that the Gospel had been conveyed to Britain at an early period. In all probability Hilary, the distinguished bishop of Poictiers, about A.D. 350, included Britain in his description of the founding of churches in all parts of the world by the apostles, in the words "in the isles of the sea." Arnobius Junior, in his writing on Psalm cxlvii., about the middle of the fifth century, used the following words :—"So swiftly runneth his word, that whereas for so many thousand years God was known in Judea alone, now within a few years he has been revealed to the very Indians, and even to the Britons from the extreme west." The above are taken from the able work, "The Ancient British Church," by Rev. Canon Pryce.

We do not desire to rely on accounts which are legendary. Such is now admitted to be the case with the story of the martyrdom of St. Alban, as narrated by Gildas, and after him by Bæda. There are, however, some important facts in history which imply the early existence of the Christian church in Britain. In the year A.D. 314, an important council was summoned to meet at Arles in Gaul, or France, to settle a disputed question between Cæcilian, the bishop of Carthage, and the Donatists. We need not here describe the dispute. Some two hundred bishops assembled at this council from various parts of the Christian world. British bishops were invited to the council, and three actually attended. They were Eborius, bishop of York : Eborius Episcopus de civitate Eboracensi Provincia Britannia. The second was Restitutus, the bishop of London ; and Adelfius, the bishop of Lincoln. According to some critics, the transcribers made a mistake in reference to Lincoln. The correct record substitutes for Lincoln, Caer Leon, in South Wales. In addition to the bishop of the last place, there were present a presbyter and a deacon. The presence of these British bishops at this council implied that the British church was well organised, and this implied that the church had existed for a considerable time. After the introduction of Christianity into the country, some time must elapse before the church could be well organised, and the natives, previously idolators, be taught and cultured in the Christian religion, and the bishops and presbyters be qualified to take an intelligent part in the discussion and determination of subtle theological and ecclesiastical questions. This consideration would reasonably lead us back to the second century. The language then spoken in Gaul was a branch of the Celtic, and was intelligible to the Britons. The British representatives would thus have no difficulty in their intercourse with the Gauls in the council.

Another fact of some importance in this connection is the existence and activity of the great heretic Pelagius. He was a Briton, according to the testimony even of Augustine, though Jerome, by some confusion, called him a Scot. He was undoubtedly a Briton, a Cymro ; or, as we should say in modern times, a Welshman. He came from Wales, and he was educated and trained for the priestly office at the celebrated Monastery of Bangor Iscoed, in Flintshire. This establishment was not merely a monastery, but also a seminary, or a college, where priests, or, as we should say, ministers or clergy, were trained for the church. According to some accounts, it was so large, that 2,400 monks were resident there at one time. The number was probably exaggerated. There are now no visible remains of this monastery, but in some former times there were remains of many ruined churches and houses. This monastery was destroyed after the battle of Chester, in the year A.D. 613, when Ethelfred, king of Northumbria, conquered the Britons under Brochwel Yscythrog, king of Powys. The monks from Bangor Iscoed, to the number of 1,200, were summoned by Brochwel to aid in the battle against the invaders. The monks were posted on a hill where they offered prayers for the intervention of God. Ethelfred, however, had no respect for monks, and he put them all to the sword. After this slaughter the monastery passed away. In this monastery, about the close of the fourth century, Pelagius was trained. His British name was Morgan, Pelagius being his Latinised name, after the custom of the times.

He left Bangor and Britain and went to Rome, and visited other countries. He was joined in A.D. 409 by an advocate named Cœlestius. He became acquainted with the great Augustine. In 415 he visited Palestine during Jerome's residence there. In 413, or thereabout, he began to proclaim his peculiar doctrines. When or where he died does not appear from history. None of his works have been preserved to the present time, but there are fragments found in the writings of St. Augustine and St. Jerome in the discussion of the questions by those distinguished fathers. The charges against his companion, Cœlestius, at the council of Carthage, in the year 412, indicate the nature of the dogmas which constituted the essence of Pelagianism. Pelagius against the prevailing theology contended that the sin of Adam affected himself only, and was not transmitted to his descendants and to all mankind ; that the will of every man is free to choose the evil and the good ; that happiness and even salvation, or eternal life, can be secured by individual activity. He admitted, however, that a higher degree of happiness, or a loftier status of being, may be obtained through Christianity, and that baptism was the condition of this higher degree of life. According to him, divine grace was manifested in the supplying of new and greater motives to individual effort through the teaching and example of Jesus Christ, giving him greater power over the impulses of the senses and the outward temptations to sin. He seemed, however, to maintain

that the initial movement belonged to the individual man himself, in the personal determination to practise a virtuous life. He opposed the ordinary church doctrine of God's predestination, contending that it was not absolute, but conditioned on the divine foreknowledge of the free actions of men, in this respect resembling the contention of modern Arminians.

These dogmas of Pelagius created much excitement in the churches of the fifth century, and led to much controversy and final condemnation as heresy. If Pelagius had lived and taught in the nineteenth century, his dogmas would have been treated in a more qualified manner. It would be admitted by the greatest theologians that the will of man is and must be free, otherwise it would be no will at all. A free will is equivalent to a will itself, and is a necessary element in the idea of human personality, and is the basis of responsibility. A human being without a personal will which is free is only *a thing*, a phenomenon, the creature of the ordinary circumstances and forces of the natural life to which no true responsibility could attach. There may be a difficulty in reconciling this free will with the divine action on the world and on man ; but the fact must be recognised as ultimate, if the greatness and responsibility of man must be conceded. Pelagius, however, went much beyond this, and proclaimed dogmas which seemed to undermine the redemptive system of Christ. The denial of the consequences of Adam's sin to the race was in contradiction to the ordinary facts of human life, which clearly indicate the law that parents do transmit their qualities to their children. This law is the basis of the Christian dogma of human depravity or degeneracy, inherited from our ancestors and ultimately from the first man and his apostasy. It is also in opposition to the modern dogma of heredity, so much insisted upon by modern scientists as the basis of correct views on human nature. This, however, is not the same thing as hereditary *guilt*. We have inherited our nature and its depravity from the primitive man and his apostasy, but we are not guilty of Adam's sin. We do not come into existence as individuals free from any consequences from our ancestors and begin life as new beings entirely apart from the past.

We do not wish to pursue this discussion any further. It is introduced for the purpose of showing that Christian thought in Britain in the fourth century must have been advanced and matured. Such discussions as those involved in Pelagianism on the free and personal will of man could not have arisen among a people recently brought over from paganism. Pelagius was the creature of British culture of the fourth century. Even a heresy resting on profound speculations of a theologico-philosophical nature concerning the rational and spiritual nature of man implied a long process of culture successfully promoted. Further, the monastery at Bangor Iscoed, where Pelagius was educated and trained, had apparently been long in existence, had grown into a large and prosperous institution in the fourth century. These facts

clearly indicate that Christianity must have been long in existence anterior to the fourth century, and take us back to the second century, and possibly earlier. Pelagius was confessedly a man of profound thought, and of a good moral and pious life, even according to the testimony of Augustine. His theological opinions were, however, untrue, and have universally been condemned as heretical. They prevailed in several parts of Europe, and especially in Britain. The personal influence and the abilities of Pelagius promoted their acceptance among his countrymen, though not among the majority. The Gallican bishops were appealed to to aid the Britons against this new and powerful heresy, and two persons were sent from Gaul to oppose it. They were Germanus, or Garmon, and Lupus, or Bleiddyn, two Gallican bishops. There were two missions, and the result was successful. The British people gave up the heresy, and have ever since remained faithful to orthodox Christianity.

CHAPTER XII

A.D. 410—448

THE BRITONS AFTER THE DEPARTURE OF THE ROMANS

The Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain in the early part of the fifth century, probably in the year 409, after an occupation of about 366 years. The condition of the empire was such that the legions were required for service elsewhere, and Britain could no longer be occupied and defended. The Romans, however, did not profess to abandon their claim to the country, and to exclude it from the limits of the empire. The strength of the empire had been much diminished, and even broken, by military revolts. Even in Britain, before the Roman departure, the legions became insubordinate, and set up their generals as emperors. After the departure, the Britons were left to themselves. In 410 the Roman emperor, Honorius, sent a letter commanding the Britons to provide for their own government and defence. The Britons were a brave and warlike people, and were wholly undeserving of the character of cowards given to them by some superficial writers. The Romans had no braver foes, who held out against their progress longer than any other people. The best of Roman writers and generals admit this, and Tacitus bears the same testimony in his Life of Agricola. During the long period of the Roman domination, the Britons had, to a large extent, become unaccustomed to warlike operations. Some Britons were taken by the Romans, and formed into troops and parts of the Roman armies, but they were sent out of their own country to do service in Gaul, or Germany, and other parts of the empire.

When the Romans left, they were not organised and armed efficiently for warlike operations. Their enemies were many and powerful. The Germans, under the name of the Saxons, had even during the Roman occupation harassed the country, coming in bands of marauding pirates and robbers, which even the Romans had been obliged to oppose by a special force under the commander designated the Count of the Saxon shore. Now that the country was destitute of the organised force of the Roman legions these pirates renewed, and even increased their incursions. Not only was the country harassed by the Saxons on the Eastern coasts, but the Irish from Ireland came as freebooters, and

scourged the western coast, which we now know as Wales. These Irish pirates even established colonies in Wales. Men of their own branch of the Celtic race had remained in Wales from the primitive settlement, who had been driven to the west by the Brythons, or the Cymric branch, but they had not been entirely driven out of the country. Possibly this Gadhelic remainder encouraged the marauders. Anyhow, the Irish became in this age of freebooting a source of trouble to the Britons.

The chief enemies of the Britons in this period, however, were the peoples known under the names of the Picts and the Scots, who proceeded from the north, or Scotland, as we designate the country. Who were these peoples? The Picts received their name, probably, from their custom of painting their bodies, especially in times of war. The Britons, according to Cæsar, painted themselves in his day; but, probably, under the influence of Roman civilisation, they gave up the practice. There can be no doubt that the northern tribes here referred to did paint themselves, and on this account were designated the Picts, the painted men. Of course, they did not call themselves Picts. The name was given to them by the Romans, and afterwards by the Britons. The word Picti is, according to Professor Rhys (p. 238), for the first time applied to this people by Eumenius in the year 296. The people who resided beyond the Roman northern wall were comprehended under this designation. The people known anciently as the Atecotti, residing on the Solway, were probably a branch of the same people, and sometimes called the Picts of Galloway. In former times the Picts were considered to be a British, perhaps a Brythonic, people. In more recent times they are regarded as a branch of the non-Aryan people called, in South Britain, the Iberians. This is, of course, a matter of opinion. In all probability they were the same people known under the Roman denomination as the Caledonians. They occupied the eastern part of North Britain.

The Scots associated with the Picts in British history were a tribe or sept who had come from the north of Ireland. According to Professor Rhys, these Scots from Ireland, who had commonly been at war with the other Irish tribes, were of the same race as the Picts of the north, and were, like them, a non-Aryan people. In the fourth century they joined the Picts in their incursions into Britain, and many battles were fought between these confederates and the Roman troops. In the year 369, Theodosius, the great Roman general, fought and conquered them, and drove them to the north. These were the people who gave the Britons the greatest trouble after the departure of the Romans. The two names are connected in history. The Scots ultimately settled in Argyle, and became the dominant people of the western part of North Britain, and gave to the entire country the name Scotland, by which the whole of the country is now known. Whatever race these tribes belonged to, Aryan or non-Aryian, Iberic or Celtic, we find that the names given to the places in Scotland were Celtic. In

the eastern part of Scotland the names seem Brythonic, or Cymric, and in the western Goidelic, or Gadhelic. For instance, in the former, the name for the confluence of waters is *aber*, the same as is so common in Wales with the same meaning. In the latter, or western side, the word used is *inver*, to denote the same thing, the meeting of waters. In the one case we have Aberdeen, and in the other Inverary, or Inverness. If we formed our opinions on the basis of language, we should be disposed to contend that the ancient inhabitants of the eastern side of Scotland were Brythons, or Cymry, the same as those of Wales, and the inhabitants of the western side were Gaels, or Goidels, the same as those of Ireland. Some modern historical critics, however, including Skene, think too much importance has been placed on the distinctions of words, including *aber* and *inver*, which are really found mixed in east and west of Scotland.

Whoever the peoples, the Picts and Scots, were originally, it is certain that they were the most formidable and cruel foes of the Britons after the departure of the Romans in the first half of the fifth century. The Britons at this time were divided among themselves, and were thus more easily a prey to the invaders. They, however, did make efforts to defend themselves. In the year 410 they got rid of the Roman officials who had remained behind after the departure of the legions, and undertook the task of forming a government and raising a native army. The form of government established by them after the departure of the Romans is not certainly known. In all probability they did not return to the tribal mode of administration, such as existed anterior to the Roman conquest. They were not, however, a homogeneous people, thoroughly united into a compact nation under one strong and central government. There were amongst them a considerable minority of foreigners, or of mixed blood, the offsprings of Roman settlers and soldiers, mainly of the Teutonic race, and of British women. These had considerable sympathy with the Saxon invaders. The Britons themselves were not fully united. They were not, consequently, well prepared to contend successfully against their foes. The government established was probably an imitation of the Roman. There were native armies raised and placed in the old Roman stations, north and south. Their generals, or commanders, were the successors of the Roman officers, who were designated the Counts of the Saxon shore, Comes Littoris Saxonici, and the Dux Britanniarum. According to Professor Rhys, they designated these governors or commanders by the British name "Gwledig," a term which signifies a prince or ruler. This is the term used in Welsh history to designate those who held supreme power, thus avoiding the use of any terms which corresponded with king and emperor in the Roman sense.

Under these native commanders the Britons contended against their foes successfully for thirty years after the legions had departed. The most distinguished of these rulers noted by British historians was Aurelius Ambrosius, or, in the British language,

Emrys. He was descended from a Roman, but identified himself with the Britons and the British cause. During this period the Britons drove back the invaders, Saxon and Picts and Scots ; but they returned again and again, until the Britons became less able to stand against them. In their difficulties they applied to the Romans to assist them. According to native accounts, which cannot be entirely relied upon, the Romans sent military assistance on two occasions, which was successful in driving back the invaders ; but, after their departure, the invaders returned in greater force. The third appeal was made to the Roman consul Æthius. This appeal was expressed in such terms that it was called " The Groans of the Britons." The appeal could not be favourably answered. The Romans were themselves in difficulties ; and the Britons were left to their fate.

CHAPTER XIII

A.D. 449—577

THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS

We now enter upon a new stage in the history of ancient Britain. The Roman domination had come to an end, owing to the decay of the empire. The Britons, through disunion and want of complete military organisation, had become feeble, and unable to defend themselves against their powerful foes and to maintain their independence. The same lesson is given in all periods of British history, namely, that a disunited people, however brave, cannot ultimately stand against foes organised and united. The Teutonic tribes that ultimately occupied and conquered Britain we designate here for convenience Anglo-Saxons. The person who was supreme in Britain, or was king, at this time, is called in history Vortigern. He is described as king of Kent. There is much legend mixed up with his history, and some even doubt whether there was such a man. The account states that this king, seeing that the Britons could not defend themselves successfully against the Saxons, who attacked them by sea, and the Picts and Scots, who advanced from the north by land, made up his mind to form an alliance with the Saxons under Hengist, with the view of repelling the invasions of the Picts. Hengist made a feast, and invited Vortigern, preliminary to the formation of the alliance. The story states that Hengist had a daughter named Rowena, who, after the manners of the time, served at the table; and she was very beautiful, and Vortigern, though a married man and the father of grown-up children, fell in love with her, and, having lost his reason, asked Hengist to give him his daughter and he would give him the kingdom of Kent. The king consented. The nobles or chiefs, however, would not have a stranger over them, and they deposed Vortigern and placed his son Vortimer on the throne. Then followed a war, and the Britons drove the Saxons from the country, and they disappeared in their ships for the period of five years. Vortimer reigned for this time, and then he died. The father, Vortigern, was then restored to the throne.

Then the Saxons under Hengist appeared again, and demanded the fulfilment of the promise made by Vortigern, who demanded that he should be allowed to consult his nobles. By arrangement

three hundred British nobles, and as many Saxon chiefs met, and had a feast. During the feast, by a previous understanding, Hengist gave the order, and the Saxons slew with their daggers the three hundred British nobles. The Saxons then seized the country and held it. In consequence of this foul crime, and the surrender of the country, Vortigern was called the traitor to his country. How much of this story is genuine history, and how much legend, it is difficult to say. In all probability, the parts relating to the feast, the maid Rowena, and the slaughter of the three hundred nobles are the mythical representation of the poets in after times to account for the triumph of the Saxons and their acquisition of Kent. Some historical critics of modern times doubt whether there ever was a Saxon leader of the name Hengist. The facts that are certain are the conquest of the country in the former half of the fifth century, and the defeat of the Britons, the result of an invitation to the Saxons to aid the Britons against their most powerful foes, the Picts of the north.

The Teutonic tribes that invaded Britain at different times, and ultimately conquered the country, were of three descriptions—the Jutes, the Saxons proper, and the Angles. There were more than three invasions, but the invaders consisted of one or the other of these three groups. For a long time these tribes harassed the British shores even during the Roman occupation. Now that the Romans were gone and the Britons were left to themselves, they came with greater boldness and success.

The first comers were the Jutes, whose home was the peninsula still known as Jutland. These Jutes are described as the first comers and settlers, according to the most ancient native historians, such as Gildas, who wrote in the sixth century, followed by the venerable Bede. These Jutes came in three ships first, to aid the Britons against the Picts : their leaders were Hengist and Horsa. The names of these leaders are regarded by some modern critics as mythical and unhistorical, but we need not discuss here this question. There were leaders and commanders of the Jutes, whatever may have been their names. They came first as friends, and the Isle of Thanet was allotted to them as the reward of their services. The time of their arrival is now generally admitted to be A.D. 449, or 450. The place where they landed was Ebbsfleet, near the modern town of Margate, called in the ancient account Yhwines-Flut. The Isle of Thanet was then divided from the mainland of Cantium, or Kent, by a small channel, navigable to such ships as were then used at high tide, and could be crossed at low water only by one ford. This channel is now closed up. The number of the Jutes brought over in three ships could not be many hundreds. Having, however, secured their position, they sent and invited others of their countrymen to join them, an invitation which was accepted. Their numbers were thus gradually increased, until they became a formidable power. Their promise to aid the Britons in opposing the Picts and Scots was fulfilled. In the period immediately following the landing, the Jutes and Britons united,

and proceeded to meet the Picts, and defeated them in a battle somewhere on the eastern coast, and drove them back to their home.

The Jutes, however, soon became dissatisfied with their position on the Isle of Thanet. The place became too small for their increasing numbers. They coveted the fertile country which they had helped to save from the ravages of the northern barbarians. Their number was continually increased ; on one occasion sixteen vessels arrived, carrying a large number of warriors. It was impossible under these circumstances that the friendship should continue long. The invaders quarrelled with the Britons, and resolved to conquer the country and form permanent settlements therein. Thus the friends and auxiliaries became the enemies of the Britons, and a war commenced between them. The Jutes crossed over the channel which separated the Isle of Thanet from the mainland, and marched into the interior of Kent. The movement was probably sudden and unexpected by the Britons. The Jutes were under the command of Hengist, and the Britons under Vortigern, the king. The Britons placed themselves in position of defence on the ford of the Medway, at the place which is called Aylesford, about four miles from Maidstone. There the first battle took place, called afterwards the battle of Aylesford. The struggle was severe, but the Britons were defeated. The second leader of the Jutes, Horsa, was slain, and the memory of his death and tomb is given in the name of Horsted. The result of this battle was that Hengist and his son Esc or Eric took the kingdom of Kent and Vortigern and the Britons had to retreat. This battle took place in the year 455, or six years after the arrival of the Jutes, during which time their numbers had largely increased.

After this battle the Jutes, in better order and organisation, advanced towards West Kent. Two years, however, passed before another battle was fought. This took place in the year 457, at the passage of the small stream or brook called the Cray, and henceforth called Crayford. The battle of Crayford must have been very bloody, for the account, probably an exaggeration, states that four thousand Britons were slain. The victory of the Jutes was complete, and the Britons retreated to London, forsaking "Kentland." After this great battle a change took place in the country. The Romano-Britons were dissatisfied with Vortigern and his government, and under their leader, Aurelius Ambrosianus, a descendant of the Roman general of the same name, they rose in rebellion and overthrew Vortigern and drove him to the mountains. After this we learn nothing of the British leader. In the meantime the Jutes were ravaging Kent and turning it into a desert. Aurelius marched against them, defeated them, and drove them to their original position in the Isle of Thanet. The Jutes were here imprisoned for some years by Aurelius, and also by the Britons who held the two fortified positions, Richborough and Reculver, at both ends of the inlet dividing Thanet from the mainland. In the year 465 another

battle was fought at a place called Wippedsfleet. The place is uncertain, and the name is supposed to be derived from a Saxon chief, Wipped, who fell in the battle. The battle was a severe one, and twelve British chiefs are reported as slain. The victory was for the Jutes.

In the year 473 another battle took place. The Jutes were commanded by Hengist and his son. The Britons were defeated and fled from the field, and the Jutes took much booty. This battle was decisive, and gave to the Jutes full and permanent possession of Cantium, or Kent. The Jutes now advanced into the country, and extended their dominion beyond Kent proper. They did not seem, however, to have done much greater work than the permanent establishment of the kingdom of Kent. In after times they conquered the Isle of Wight, and some territory opposite in the district of Southampton. Hengist reigned over Kent until the year 488, when he was succeeded by his son Esc. Hengist died in the year 490, about forty years after his landing in the country.

The second invasion of Britain took place in the year 477. The invaders were the Saxons proper, and they became in history the South Saxons, from whom the county of Sussex is named. These invaders were under the command of Ella and his three sons, Cymen, Wlencing, and Cissa. They were Saxons proper, and came from the country now known by the name of Schleswick-Holstein. They were reported as coming in three ships, like their predecessors. They landed in Sussex, at a place called after the name of Ella's eldest son, Cymen's-ora, or Keynor. The inhabitants of this region were of course Britons, but separate from those of Kent. They had to defend their homes themselves. The invaders were not at first numerous, and their success was only gradual. Battle after battle was fought, resulting in the defeat of the Britons. The great forest of Andredsweald was situated in this region, and the Britons escaped to this for shelter and the means of defending themselves. The fortified town of Anderida, or known later as Pevensey, left by the Romans, was occupied by the Britons. The Saxons besieged this place. The siege was long and prolonged, but ultimately the Saxons captured it and slew the entire garrison. This took place in the year 490.

After a struggle of fourteen years the Britons were conquered and the kingdom of the South Saxons was established. The Britons must have offered an obstinate resistance during this period of fourteen years, but were finally overcome by the increasing number of the Saxons, who in their victory showed themselves to be cruel barbarians. There was another Roman city held by the Britons named Regnum, so called from the ancient tribe Regni. We have no account of any great British stand having been made there. Historians think that the place submitted without any long siege. The name was changed into Cissan-ceaster, after one of the sons of Ella, Cissa, meaning the fort of Cissa, and ultimately assumed the present name of Chichester.

The third body of invaders, also Saxons proper, came under

their two chiefs, Cerdic and his son Cynric. This was in the year 495 according to the Chronicle. They came in five ships, and landed at a place afterwards called Cerdic's-ore, and judged to be the mouth of the Itchen, now known as the important town of Southampton. The country they seized and occupied was that belonging to the tribes known as Belgic, and is now Hampshire. Very soon after landing they began a war with the Britons, or Welsh. We have no precise information as to the course of the war. There was an important battle fought in the year 506 by Cerdic and Cynric, in which 5,000 men were slain and a British king or chief named Natanileod, after whom the Chronicle states that Netley, near Southampton, was called, and the country Natanlea as far as Cerdicasford or Charford. There is, however, much doubt concerning the derivation of these and other names. During the twelve years from the landing of the chiefs to this battle the Saxons had not made much progress, as they were still near the landing-place, showing that the Britons of that district were not easily conquered.

Before the battle mentioned the Chronicle informs us that in the year 501 another chief named Port and his two sons, Bieda and Maegla, at the head of a body of men, landed at a place called after him Portsmouth. The derivation of the name is probably mythical.

In the year 514 another body of men landed under the command of Stuf and Wigtgar, and they landed at Cerdic's-ore. The leaders were said to be nephews of Cerdic, and consequently Saxons. We learn from Bede and other sources that they were Jutes and merely allies of Cerdic. They were of the same tribe as the men of Kent. For their services they received from Cerdic the Isle of Wight and some territory on the opposite mainland. The Saxons under Cerdic and Cynric, aided by the Jutes, now gradually acquired the country of Hampshire, and extended into Somersetshire. In 519–521 they established the kingdom of the West Saxons, and conquered the Britons. Cerdic, the great leader of the West Saxons, died in the year 534, and his son Cynric succeeded him. It was he that handed over the Isle of Wight to the Jutes as the reward of their assistance.

The Saxons made great efforts to extend their dominion in a westerly and north-westerly direction, but they received a great check in a battle between them and the Britons, in which they were defeated. This was the battle of Badon Hill, near Bath. It is recorded that the renowned Arthur commanded the Britons, and Cerdic the West Saxons. Some historians have regarded the story of this battle, and even the existence of King Arthur, as mythical. This, however, is to carry historical criticism to extremes. The battle and the man, though surrounded by much darkness, were realities. The battle was fought in 520, though Bede erroneously places it later. This British victory for several years arrested the progress of the West Saxons in the west, under Cerdic and Cynric.

King Arthur was probably the king of the Dumnonii, whose territory embraced the modern counties of Devon and Cornwall and adjacent territory, though there is some doubt on the subject. The battle of Badon Hill, or Mons Badonicus, was gained mainly through the courage and impetuosity of Arthur himself. It has been declared in Welsh history that this was the twelfth and the last great battle in which Arthur fought and won. This battle continued two days, and on the second day Arthur and his Britons broke the Saxon lines and drove them back, thus saving Western Britain for some time. According to Church, in his "Early Britain" (p. 100), "The fight at Badon Hill is the one event in his long struggle with the invaders which seems historical." There can be no doubt that the noble qualities of the hero were much exaggerated by the imagination of the Bards, and his deeds embellished. Nevertheless, there is a sufficient residuum of fact to believe in the greatness and the reality of the man.

There may be differences of opinion as to the precise locality of Badon Hill, whether near Bath, as most think, or Badbury Rings, in Dorsetshire, as Dr. Guest thought, or Boudin Hill, near Linlithgow, as contended by Skene; and there may be various theories as to the part of Britain where Arthur resided, but we can scarcely doubt that there was a battle of Badon Hill, and that there was a hero called Arthur. The career of Arthur after this battle is largely shrouded in darkness. The native account states that he had enemies among his own kindred, that he was wounded in an encounter with his own nephew and removed to an island near Glastonbury, where he died. The time of Arthur's death was probably the year 542. He lived, however, longer than his enemy Cerdic, who died in 534, and was succeeded by his son Cynric, who reigned over the kingdom of the West Saxons for twenty-seven years, and died in the year 560. During his reign the boundaries of Wessex were extended and the capital was fixed at Winchester.

The fourth band of invaders landed on the eastern coast in the year 527. They also were Saxons, and became known as the East Saxons, and from them we have the name of Essex, the country formerly known as the land of the Trinobantes, and where was established the Roman colony of Camulodunum. Their leader was named Ercenwine. They seemed to have easily conquered the Logrian Britons of Essex and founded the kingdom of the East Saxons. This kingdom also comprehended Middlesex, or the Middle Saxons, and a part of the county of Hertfordshire, and its capital was London. During a part of its separate existence it was much subject to the rulers of the neighbouring kingdoms. Nevertheless it maintained a normal independence for 281 years under fourteen kings. Under the last of these kings the Church of St. Paul was founded, which became the Cathedral.

We come now to a time when a new and most important tribe of Teutonic invaders made their appearance—the fifth band. These were the Angles who ultimately gave their name to the whole

country, England. They came from the district of the Baltic, perhaps from Schleswick, near the primitive residences of the Jutes and the Saxons. They are considered to be closely related to the Saxons, but bearing a different tribal name. They came under the leadership of Uffa. Very little is known of the Angles. They came and occupied the counties now known as Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, and the Isle of Ely, and the district formerly known as the territories of the Iceni. They came probably as two tribes, or branches, and settled in the country as North and South Folks. They extended also as far as Lincolnshire. The kingdom of East Anglia was established about the year A.D. 575, and continued for many years under seventeen or eighteen kings.

Another band of Angles—the sixth—landed in the North at Flamborough Head in the year 547, and established the kingdom of Northumbria, or the country north of the Humber, the country occupied formerly by the ancient Coritani. This district was at that time occupied by the Britons, and formed two kingdoms called Deifyr, extending from the Humber to the Tyne, and Berneich, extending from the Tyne to the Frith of Forth. The Romanised form of these names was Deira and Bernicia. Under their leader, Ida, the Angles advanced against the Britons with great fury and violence, and spread desolation wherever they went. The terror excited by their progress led the native Britons to call Ida, Flamddwyn, or the Flame-man. He encountered, however, brave and heroic men, who refused to submit to the invaders until completely mastered. The British leaders were brave and able men. Several victories were gained by the Britons, in one of which, on the banks of the Clyde, Ida himself perished. But in this, as well as the other parts of the country, the Britons were destined to be conquered and subdued. The great battle of Cattraeth in the north destroyed the hopes of the Britons. Some of the leaders were slain, and others escaped. The result was that Bernicia became a separate Anglian kingdom under Ida and his successors. The two kingdoms were, however, united afterwards under Aedelfred, grandson of Ida, Deira having been subdued by another band of Angles, under Ella, who became its king. In the year 617 the united kingdom, under Edwin, was designated Northumbria, and continued long one of the most powerful of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms.

The last Anglo-Saxon kingdom was founded by Angles, who proceeded from Northumbria and East Anglia. The name of this kingdom in history is Mercia. These Anglians penetrated into the heart of Britain, into what we now call the Midland counties, as far as the borders of Wales and the boundaries of other kingdoms, especially that of the West Saxons. The leader of these Anglians was Crida. In their advance they wrested from the Britons the territory intervening between Northumbria and Wessex. And because the land they seized and turned into a separate kingdom bordered on other kingdoms and on Wales, it was most probably called Mercia, from the German *merk*, "a boundary." There is no

full record of the events that occurred in this last conquest, but there is reason to believe that it was not effected without much fighting and losses on both sides. The territory was constituted into a separate state about the end of the sixth century. For a while it was dependent on Northumbria ; but in the year 626 it was made an independent kingdom by Penda, the noted king. The founder, Crida, died in 600. Its capital was Leicester, though that varied at different times ; and its area comprehended the counties Huntingdon in part, Rutland, Lincoln, Northampton, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Worcester, Stafford, Warwick, Salop in part, Buckingham, and Bedford. It was thus one of the most extensive and important of the Anglo-Saxon states. The inhabitants were made up of Angles mainly, and Saxons from the bordering states.

From the previous brief narrative of the formation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms it will be seen that the invaders pushed their conquests from south and east to the north and west, until they occupied the greater part of what is now called England, as distinguished from Wales and Scotland. The precise boundaries of the kingdoms of Mercia and Wessex varied at different periods. The river Severn was for a portion of the state the boundary for a time, but King Offa extended the line beyond the Severn, and constructed a ditch to separate it from the territory of the Britons. The struggle continued from the middle of the fifth to nearly the end of the sixth century, a period of about 150 years. The result of the long and bloody contest was the gradual subjugation of the Britons, or their expulsion from one district after another, until they found a refuge in the mountains of the west and north-west and the extremities of the country.

CHAPTER XIV

THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS—CONTINUATION OF THE CONTEST

The Anglo-Saxons had now gained permanent settlements in the greater part of Britain, and had pushed the Britons westward. The Jutes had their kingdom in Kent ; the South Saxons in Surrey and Sussex ; the East Saxons in Essex, Middlesex, and part of Herts ; the East Angles in Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, and Ely. The Angles again in Northumbria comprehending Northumberland, Durham, and portions of Cumberland, Westmorland, Yorkshire, and Lancashire ; the same Angles in the larger district called Mercia, already described. The West Saxons were in Hampshire, Berkshire, Wiltshire, Dorset and Somerset in part, and were aiming to extend themselves to the region of Devon and Cornwall.

By the British victory at Badon Hill in 520, under the renowned Arthur, the West Saxons had been checked, and they made no serious effort to advance in the West for thirty years. In the meantime the leaders in the battle of Badon Hill had died. Cerdic, the great warrior of the West Saxons, died in the year 534, leaving his son Cynric to succeed him as king and leader. The British hero, King Arthur, died in 542. The West Saxons, however, renewed their activity, and directed their march against the Britons who still held the greater portion of what we call the West of England. Under Cynric the West Saxons came into collision with the Britons in the year 552, and a battle was fought at Scarbyric, better known as Old Sarum, near Salisbury. The Britons were defeated and fled. In the year 556 another battle was fought at a place called Barbury Hill. This place was situated probably between Swindon and Marlborough. One writer, Mr. Thorp, identifies the place with Banbury in Oxfordshire. For some years not much progress was made by the West Saxons against the Britons. The Saxon leader Cynric died in the year 560, and was succeeded by his son Ceawlin. The dominion of this king extended as far as our county of Surrey. The fact is the boundaries of the various states fluctuated from time to time, and only a general description is possible. He began his reign by coming into conflict with Athelbert, king of Kent. Then he directed his march northward, and fought against the Britons at

Bedford and captured four towns (one of which was Aylesbury) in Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Oxfordshire. These military movements took place in 571. The facts narrated show how uncertain were the boundaries and how much territory was still occupied by the Britons.

After these events the West Saxons advanced further to the west under Ceawlin the king, and his brother Cuthwine, or Cutha. Their advance westward was not rapid, for they were hindered by the nature of the country, by the large forests of Dorsetshire, and that of the Frome valley. The West Saxons directed their march towards the Severn valley. The country was rich naturally, and during the Roman occupation had been subjected to the best cultivation. They proceeded not from Oxfordshire across the Cotswolds, but direct from Wiltshire, along the Lower Severn valley, as described by Dr. Guest. In the district aimed at, there were three important Romano-British cities. These were Corinium or Cirencester ; Glevum or Gloucester ; and Aquæ Solis, or Bathan-ceaster as known to the Saxons, or our Bath. These cities were very important and the centres of large districts—a part of Somersetshire and the Cotswolds, and the Lower Severn valley, extending to Worcestershire. The largest and most important of these cities was Corinium, or Cirencester. Its area was probably three times that of the modern town. The city of Glevum or Gloucester was not as large as Corinium, but was important from its situation and its nearness to the Forest of Dean, where important ironworks were then carried on. The city of Bath was then as now the resort of invalids. The baths uncovered in recent times show clearly that under the occupation of the Romans it was an important "watering-place." The Romans called it Aquæ Solis, "the waters of the god Sol or Sul." Then as now the hot mineral waters flowed in abundance, and were used as remedial means for the cure of gout and rheumatism. It was then probably a fashionable resort. The Saxons called the place Bathan-ceaster, afterwards contracted into the modern name of Bath.

These three cities were then the most important in the West, and two of them were strong military stations under the Roman domination, and continued strong places under the Britons, and were the centres of large districts under native government. The people of these three cities and their surrounding districts seem to have formed a confederacy to resist the Saxons. Their kings, or chiefs, are given in the Saxon Chronicle as Conmael, Condidan or Kynddylan, and Farinmael. These were British or Welsh names. These three kings had assembled their united forces to resist the West Saxons at a place north of Bath called Deorham (from B. *dur*, "water" and ham), in Gloucestershire, situated on a chain of hills overlooking the Severn valley. This village is now called Durham, or Dyrham, and is eight miles from Bath and ten from Bristol. Here the most important and decisive battle of the age in the west took place in the year 577. The Saxons were com-

manded by their king, Ceawlin, assisted by his brother Cutha, the sons of Cynric and grandsons of Cerdic. The battle was severe, fought on both sides with bravery and great courage. The result was the entire defeat of the Britons, and the occupation of the three cities by the Saxons. The consequence of this Saxon victory was most serious to the future history and destiny of the Britons.

The portion of the country we now know as Somersetshire, Devonshire, and Cornwall was then called West Wales, as distinguished from North Wales, then embracing the North and South Wales of our times. West Wales was peopled by Britons alone, and hitherto had not been much affected by the Saxon invasion. Now, however, they were cut off from the rest of their countrymen. The Saxons came as a wedge, cleaving the two branches of the Britons entirely apart. Henceforth the destiny of the two portions of the Britons was different. The west continued to be peopled by Britons, and was only gradually subdued by the Saxons. It took about a century and a half to entirely conquer the district embraced by our counties of Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and part of Dorset. The people remained, however, Celtic in language and manners for many ages afterwards. A dialect of the Welsh language was spoken in Devonshire until the time of Queen Elizabeth, or the end of the sixteenth century, and this dialect died out in Cornwall only in the eighteenth century. The population of these counties must have mainly descended from the ancient Britons, mixed, of course, in recent times with English.

The Saxons were now in the possession of the Severn valley, which extended from the estuary of that river to Worcestershire. They advanced up this valley into Worcestershire, and proceeded into Shropshire and Cheshire. The important town of Shrewsbury, whose name then was Pengwern, was burnt, and the surrounding district was ravaged. This country was governed by the King Condidan, considered by some writers to be the same person as Kynddylan, associated with British early literature. If this were the case Condidan, who fell in the battle of Deorham, could not have been king of one of the three cities conquered by Ceawlin, as mentioned above. He was merely an ally of those cities, and brought his forces from Pengwern and joined the others. There is, of course, uncertainty concerning some names and events mentioned in the ancient Chronicles without much detail. The Saxons advanced even into Cheshire and ravaged the country. These movements extended over a few years. In the year 584 another great battle was fought at a place called Fethanleag, considered by some to be Faddiley, on the border of Cheshire, but by others to be the Frethern of Gloucestershire. The greatest authorities, as Guest and Green, are in favour of the Cheshire place, which was situated about three miles from Nantwich. It is known that Ceawlin advanced after the battle of Deorham along the course of the Severn, through Worcestershire, and that he arrived before

the fortified town of Uriconium, on the banks of the Severn, near the town of Severnbridge. The Saxons attacked and destroyed this strong position. This town has been discovered and uncovered in recent times, and the ruins show that it was a place of importance and of great strength. In this battle of Faddiley the Saxons were defeated, and Cutha, the brother of Ceawlin, was slain. The Britons were led by the British chief, Brockmael. The West Saxons by this defeat lost much of their late conquests, and they were obliged to retreat. The Saxons also quarrelled among themselves, and their settlers on the Lower Severn district rose in rebellion and elected as their chief or king Ciol or Ceolric, the son of the late Cutha. This internal division weakened the power of the West Saxons for a period of two hundred years. During these struggles the boundary between Wales and the Saxon territory fluctuated, but at the close, near the sixth century, what was then called North Wales, or Wales in our sense, included Monmouthshire, Herefordshire, Shropshire, Cheshire, and portions of Worcestershire and Gloucestershire.

The contest among the Saxons themselves led to the downfall of the King Ceawlin. His nephew Ceolric followed him in his retreat to the older part of his dominions of Wessex. The Britons joined Ceolric in this expedition. The united forces overtook Ceawlin in 591 at Wanborough, situated on the brink of the Downs of Wiltshire. In this battle Ceawlin was defeated and many of his men were slaughtered. He lost his throne and kingdom, and had to fly for his life. In two years after—593—he perished, probably in an attempt to regain his power and kingdom. The people who made up the army of Ceolric were Saxon settlers who bore the name of Wiccii, from which probably the name of the Worcestershire people was derived. The Britons for a time experienced a revival of their power and fighting capacity. They had defeated the West Saxons in 584 at Faddiley, and compelled them to retreat; and in 591 they aided the Wiccii under Ceolric to destroy the power of the great Saxon warrior. The Britons had received the reward of their services. Ceolric was succeeded on the throne of Wessex by his brother Ceolwulf. His reign was one of incessant war with Saxons and Britons, and Wessex for many years became weak and subordinate.

The previous pages describe the contests between the West Saxons and the Britons. We now turn to take a glance at the state of affairs in the north. The Angles of Northumbria had defeated the Britons in several battles, the history of which has been very imperfectly handed down to our times. The accounts contained in the native histories of Gildas, Nennius, and Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the writings of the Bards and the Triads are mixed up with legendary matter and poetical embellishments, so that much discrimination must be exercised in order to discover the real facts from mere fictions. The Angles who seized the country which came to be known as Northumbria were a numerous and powerful people, and continued their wars against the native

Britons through a considerable part of the sixth century. Their progress was slow, but gradual and certain. There was one battle fought which was decisive, that was the battle of Cattraeth. English historical critics have treated this battle as mythical, and have omitted it from their narratives. It has been handed down in poetical and extravagant language, but there ought to be little hesitation in accepting the fact of such a battle apart from the poetical embellishments. The precise place and date of this great battle have not been determined. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that in 547 "Ida assumed the kingdom, from whom came the royal race of Northumbrians."

The British chiefs who took a part in this war, some of whom were slain, were Rhydderch, Urien, Mynyddawg, Morgant, Llywarch Hen, and Aneurin, names which have often appeared in the literature of the Britons. The decisive battle of Cattraeth was commemorated by the great Bard Aneurin who was present, and as one of the confederated princes took a part in the engagement, and was one of the three who escaped. The poem of Aneurin, in which he commemorated and described the battle, is called the "Gododin," supposed to be the name of the principality over which he reigned. The battle has been mentioned in the Triads and elsewhere, but represented in striking and poetic language by Aneurin. This poet or bard flourished in the years 520–70. The battle must, therefore, have taken place before the last date, probably between 560 and 570. The Bards and the Triads give a very unfavourable account of the conduct and life of the Britons. They are described as given to intemperance, and this and the want of discipline led to the defeat of the Britons. The following lines indicate this :—

> "The warriors went to Cattraeth. They were famous.
> Wine and mead from golden cups had been their liquors.
> Three heroes and threescore, and three hundred
> With the golden collars.
>
> "The warriors went to Cattraeth full of laughter.
> When they returned they told their wives a tale of peace,
> But in their garments was the smell of blood."

The above verses are taken from Woodward's "History of Wales." That the battle of Cattraeth was a reality and not a mere poetic invention seems evident to us. The name may not easily be identified. According to Thomas Stephens, in his "Literature of the Cymry," the Roman town of Cataracton, now called Catterick, in the county of York, was the place called by the British Bard Cattraeth. According to him the subject of the "Gododin" was an expedition of the British tribe of the Ottadine against the town of Cataracton. This is, of course, a mere opinion. Among the chiefs who led the Britons in the north in the defence of their country against the Angles was Urien, who was king or chief of the district known as Reged. There were several places called Reged in various parts of ancient Britain—two in South Wales—

this, however, was the Reged of the North. Urien was a great British warrior, by whose sword Ida was slain according to the British account. In the Saxon Chronicle Ida died in A.D. 560. Other warriors were Rhydderch, Mynyddawg, Morgant, Llywarch Hen. They were all defeated by the Angles.

The result of the defeat of the Britons in the north was similar to that in the west and north-west. The Britons were compelled to retire, and they fled to the mountainous regions and established themselves there as separate states, where for some time they maintained their independence. These states were two in number, though often united. They were called Cumbria and Strathclyde. The former, Cumbria, comprehended Lancashire, or much of it, the western portion of Yorkshire, which was the hilly region, Westmorland and Cumberland. The latter state, Strathclyde, meaning the valley of the Clyde, extended from the Solway Firth to the Firth of Clyde. These two states were frequently under one head, though sometimes separate. The capital of Cumbria was the ancient town of Luguballium, called afterwards Caer-luel, or, Caer-liol, and finally Carlisle. The capital of Strathclyde was at first called Alcluyd, from its situation on the Clyde, afterwards Dun-Breton and Dumbarton, the fortress of the Britons. The Britons in the sixth century, after suffering many defeats and cut asunder by the Anglo-Saxon conquests, still retained much territory. The whole of Wales, in the modern sense, and neighbouring districts, the western counties of Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, and the long though narrow strip of country from Cheshire, through Lancashire, western Yorkshire, Westmorland and Cumberland to the Clyde, were still under their power and in their possession.

CHAPTER XV

THE CYMRY PROPER—THEIR OPERATIONS

According to Professor Rhys, the Cymry proper were a branch of the Brythons, those who resided in the Cumbria of the north, but the name came to be used as a national designation of the Britons, or Welsh of Wales. He states in his "Celtic Britain," p. 116, "that the word Cymry, which merely meant fellow countrymen, acquired the force and charm of a national name which it still exercises over the natives of the Principality." The Cymry of the north who formed the state of Cumbria were a very vigorous and intelligent tribe of the Brythonic people. They were finally defeated by the Angles, but they continued to maintain their independence for a long time in the northern counties mentioned above. Although conquered in course of time and brought within the limits of Anglo-Saxon domination, they have left their marks on the country and on their descendants who are largely the present population of the country. The different peoples in the course of time—Cymry, Saxons, Angles, and perhaps Picts—became mixed, but there is every probability that the present inhabitants of the long district known in history as Cumbria and Strathclyde, extending from Cheshire to the Clyde, are largely descended from the ancient Cymry. The names of localities and words employed in the common speech of the people and the features of the inhabitants indicate that they have largely come from the Cymry. The language of the Cymry probably remained in the north until the fourteenth century.

The connection of the Cymry of the north with the Welsh of Wales was maintained for several generations until the two peoples were severed by conquests. According to native British accounts there was a great man, a Cymro, in Cumbria, whose name was Cunedda. He was a leader or chief of his people. He arose soon after the departure of the Romans from Britain. Welsh tradition represents him as the supreme ruler in the north, his territory extending from the east coast before the Angles seized it to Carlisle, his capital, then called Luguballium. He was attended by a retinue of 800 horsemen. He was regarded as the king of the island of Britain, and bore the title of Gwledig, a Welsh designation which denoted prince and supreme ruler, the *over*-king, to whom the other chiefs submitted. This designation

seems to have been given to the British supreme ruler after the departure of the Romans, and corresponded in most respects to the Roman *Dux Britanniarum*, the commander-in-chief of Roman Britain. The British traditional account of the position of Cunedda is doubtless much coloured by poetical imagination. Some critical historians describe the account as a legend, and imply that there was no such person as Cunedda, but this is to carry destructive criticism too far. There was a supreme ruler, a Gwledig, among the ancient Britons, and Cunedda was among the first after the departure of the Romans. According to Nennius, his teritory was in the north, the Manaw of "Gododin." This was in the first half of the fifth century. In the judgment of Professor Rhys he "may have been the head of the noble families of the Brigantes," and had probably Roman blood in his veins, and that some of his ancestors had worn the official purple under the Roman administration. This, of course, is speculation, founded on the probabilities of the case. Cunedda, the Gwledig, had eight sons, according to Nennius.

According to tradition, Cunedda and his sons placed themselves at the head of an expedition from the north to render assistance to their Brythonic brethren in North Wales, who were engaged in war with their neighbours. Their foes were the Goidels. As previously explained, the Goidels were the same as the Gaels, one of the two branches of the Celtic family, the other being the Brythons. The Goidels were the first branch of the Celts to come from Gaul and occupy Britain, which they did probably some centuries before the Brythons. When the Brythons came they gradually drove the Goidels westward and ultimately to Ireland. They were not, however, entirely driven over the Irish Channel to Ireland. Many remained in Britain, and a considerable number of them had settled in North Wales and were not on friendly terms with the Brythons, or the Cymry. The language of the Goidels or the Gaels continued to be spoken in North Wales until the sixth or seventh century. Some of these Goidels were the remnants of the original settlers, and some were immigrants from Ireland. They were not merely at variance with the Brythons and threatened to overcome them, but they probably refused to acknowledge the authority of the Cymric Gwledig. Cunedda and his sons advanced to North Wales, and according to Nennius, slaughtered and drove the Goidels out of the country. Some of them probably emigrated to Ireland and the rest submitted and ultimately became amalgamated with the Brythons and the two peoples became one in nature and language. The Welsh people of this generation are thus descended from the two branches of the Celtic race, and also from the Iberians, or non-Aryan race. The full details of this internal war have not been handed down to us.

The result of the war was the establishment, in North Wales, of the authority of the Gwledig, Cunedda. The country was afterwards divided among the sons of Cunedda, who gave their names to the districts over which they ruled. This, however, was

probably a subsequent interpretation of the names. The tradition is that one of Cunedda's son, called Meirion, gave his name to the district now the county of Merioneth ; another son, Keredig, gave his name to Keredigion, or our county of Cardigan. Other sons in like manner gave their names to various districts. Although these uses of names may be the result of after speculation on the part of native writers or Bards, they may be regarded as indications of the power and dominion of Cunedda and his sons. The supremacy of Cunedda as the over-king,or Gwledig, seems to have been acknowledged among the Welsh of North Wales, and even beyond. The ancient people called the Ordovices were the most powerful tribe in North Wales, and for many generations were most prominent in the warlike operations of Britain. They occupied the greater part of North Wales, and they accepted the supremacy of Cunedda as the over-king. The supreme power remained in the family of Cunedda for a long time. The history of the period is anything but clear and precise from the time of Cunedda to the middle of the sixth century, or about a hundred years. About this time there arose in North Wales a great king, a descendant of Cunedda whose name was Maelgwn. He, too, extended the boundary of his dominion from North Wales to Cardiganshire, or probably to Pembrokeshire. The supreme authority, or that of the over-king, was in the hands of this prince, but other members of the Cunedda family reigned over different portions of Wales. His supremacy was recognised by the other princes as was that of Cunedda a hundred years before. The country over which Maelgwn *directly* reigned was Gwynedd, or an important portion of North Wales ; but his authority as the Gwledig or the over-king, was recognised over the whole of Wales and even among the Cymry of the north. There were in ancient times accounts of this great king, as of Cunedda before him, that were legendary, but the residuum of fact shows that his supremacy was acknowledged in Wales and among the Cymry of the north. By the power of Cunedda, Maelgwn and his family, the framework of Wales was constructed and an orderly government was established. The Goidels who were descended from the Gaelic branch of the Celts and the non-Aryan Aborigines, the Silurians, who were gradually mixed, submitted to the supremacy of the Cymry. They were conquered and some of them migrated to Ireland, but the majority remained and lived as neighbours of the Cymry. Their language remained to be spoken in North Wales until the seventh century. The two peoples remained for some time distinct but gradually became mixed. The Goidels in due course of time adopted the Welsh language, and in the seventh century the Gaelic speech disappeared and the Welsh universally prevailed. The amalgamation of the two racial branches was effected more slowly, but before the eleventh century the distinction was abolished, and henceforth the inhabitants of Wales became one united and homogeneous people. It must, however, be well understood that the modern Welsh people have descended from

the three racial elements mentioned. Mr. Skene, in his book "The Four Ancient Books of Wales," states that the seaboard of Wales on the west was in the occupation of the Gwyddyl, or Gael, and the Cymry confined to the eastern part of Wales only, and placed between them and the Saxons. A line drawn from Conway on the north to Swansea on the south would separate the two races of the Gwyddyl and the Cymry on the west and the east. He goes on to show that the Cymry possessed Gwent and Morganwg in South Wales, and the Gwyddyl in Dyfed; and Brecknock was in the possession of Brychan and his family; that Powys and the Severn Valley were ancient Cymric districts, but the stronghold of the real Cymry was Cumbria from the Dee and the Humber to the Firths of Forth and Clyde. Cunedda and his sons came from the north in the fifth century with the tribe of the Cymry to drive out the Gwyddyls from Wales, and succeeded only after two or three generations. The Cymry were newcomers and conquered North Wales and Anglesey first and under Maelgwn in the sixth century made themselves masters of South Wales. Maelgwn's accession was evidently an epoch in Welsh tribal history. He took up his residence at Aberffraw as king of Venedotia or Gwynedd; the headship of the Cymry remained henceforth in his family alone. He was the great-grandson of Cunedda, and he died about A.D. 547 of the Yellow Death. He was succeeded by his great-grandson Iago, a great leader, who fell in the battle of Chester. Then followed him his great-grandson Cadwaladr, who died during the second visitation of the Yellow Death in A.D. 664–83. The Welsh people thus became a mixture of the three races. The Cymry became the most potent and welded the three elements into one homogeneous people, who are now regarded as Celtic and Aryan. There is, of course, much of speculation in these calculations, but there can be no reasonable doubt that the three elements did enter into the final amalgamation. The same kind of mixture was effected in the formation of the French nation. For the discussion of these questions the reader may consult Elton's "Origins of English History," Guest's "Origines Celticæ," Freeman, Professor Rhys's "Celtic Britain" and the Blue Book on the Land Question in Wales, and Seebohm's "The Tribal System in Wales," and Skene's "Four Ancient Books of Wales."

According to Nennius Cunedda and his sons came to Wales from the north 146 years before Maelgwn became the Gwledig. This date seems to show that Maelgwn, the most potent descendant of Cunedda, flourished in the first part of the sixth century. Gildas, the British historian, flourished about the middle of the sixth century. He was highly esteemed by the ancients, and the name of *Sapiens*, or the Wise, was given to him. He wrote two books, one "The History of Britain," and the other he called "The Epistle," but both have been considered one work. His is the oldest history of the Britons written by a native. In some respects the history is of great value, but there is much of the mythical element in it, and there is much superstition. The style

of Gildas is very declamatory. Denunciation of his countrymen is violent and frequent. The Britons of his times—rulers and people—must have been very wicked and immoral, or his spirit was harsh and uncharitable. On pages 314–22 of "The Epistle" (Bohn's edition, Old English Chronicles) he denounces five princes whose names were Vortiporius, or Guortepir; Cuneglosos, or Cinglas; Maglocunos, or Maelgwn; Constantine, king of Dumnonium, or of Devon and Cornwall; and Aurelius, king of Powisland, at one time a separate kingdom of North Wales. He employed very strong language in his denunciation of these princes, imitating some of the prophets of the Old Testament. Of these princes Vortiporius, or Vortipore, is described as the tyrant of the Demetians, which corresponded roughly to the modern counties of Cardigan, Carmarthen, and Pembroke. Cinglas was probably king of a district "between the Severn and the western sea." Maelgwn and his kingdom have been previously described. Gwynedd he governed directly and as over-king was acknowledged through Cambria.

After Maelgwn his son Rhun succeeded as king of Gwynedd, and the over-king of the Britons. In his time there was war; the men of the North invaded Gwynedd and devastated the country probably in rebellion against Rhun, who was an able man, but not equal to his father Maelgwn. He, however, defeated the men of the North and followed them into their own district of Cumbria and Strathclyde. The men of Arvon supported Rhud and enabled him to conquer. The son of Rhud was Beli, but nothing is known of him. His son Iago probably became king and over-king for a short time. To him followed his son Cadvan as king of Gwynedd and the over-king of the Britons. The chief residence for the king of Gwynedd was Aberffraw in Anglesey. In the church of Llangadwaldar, situated near the ancient city of Aberffraw, there is an epitaph to Cadvan, probably made in the seventh century, in which he is described as "King Cadvan, the wisest and most renowned of all kings." The next king who reigned in Gwynedd was Cadwallon, the son of Cadvan, who was recognised as the supreme ruler of the Cymry.

A movement took place in the beginning of the seventh century which seriously affected the power and the unity of the Cymry. The Angles of Northumbria had overcome the Cymry of the North. King Aethelfrith had succeeded in uniting into one kingdom the two kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia after the death of Aella of Deira excluding Eadwine, the son of Aella. The young prince and his friends fled to other countries for safety. Eadwine himself sought refuge in Gwynedd at the court of Cadvan. The king of Northumbria prepared an expedition against the Cymry of North Wales, influenced by the feeling of revenge for harbouring Eadwine and also by the desire of conquest. The opposing forces came to the neighbourhood of the ancient city of Chester. This city was then the capital of the British kingdom of Gwynedd, which included the greater part of North Wales as we understand

the name. The ancient name of this city was Deva, but the Romans called it Castrum Legionum, the camp of the Legions, this being the place where one of the Roman legions had its headquarters, usually the twentieth legion. The Britons called it Caerleon, not, of course, the Caerleon on the Usk. This city was very important in the time of the Roman occupation, as is even now apparent from its Roman walls and other remains. The important Roman road, called Watling Street, running from the south through London and the centre of Britain, passed through it ; and the other road from the north passing through Cumbria also entered it. In the neighbourhood of this city the great battle between the Northumbrians, under Aethelfrith, and the Cymry, was fought in the year A.D. 613. The number of the Northumbrians has not been recorded, but must have been large. The Britons consisted of the men of Gwynedd, a hardy and a brave race. The intelligence of the danger to Chester induced the Prince of Powys to advance to the aid of his British brethren. The kingdom of Powys embraced the central or mid parts of Wales and the modern county of Salop, including the land between the Wye and the Severn. The boundary changed from time to time. The capital of this state was at the time of this battle Pengwern, now Shrewsbury. Later in its history the capital was removed to Mathrafal, near Meifod in Montgomeryshire. In addition to the troops of Gwynedd and Powys there were present on the scene of conflict about 1,200 of the 2,000 monks from the monastery of Bangor Iscoed in Flintshire, not far from Chester. They came after a long fast of three days to pray for their country. They were noticed by the Northumbrian king in their strange position of prayer and with wild gestures, and he ordered his men to slay them and only about fifty escaped. In a previous part of this book the event has been fully described. The prince or king of Powys was Brockmael, who was placed with some troops to guard the monks. Brockmael, who was then young and inexperienced, fled before the Northumbrians, and the monks were slain. Then a general engagement took place, the battle was fought with bravery on both sides, but the victory was for the Northumbrians. The Britons were defeated but the losses sustained by the Northumbrians were very great, as stated by Bede, showing that the struggle was severe. The city of Chester, along with the large district subject to its rule, was captured by Aethelfrith. This battle has been known in history as the battle of Chester.

The result of this battle was serious to the Britons. It was similar to that of the battle of Deorham in Gloucestershire in the year A.D. 577, when the Britons of Wales were cut off from their brethren of the west—Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and even Dorset. In like manner the Northumbrian victory of Chester severed the Cymry of North Wales from their brethren in Cumbria and Strathclyde. The unity of the British nation was destroyed and henceforth for some centuries they were to contend separately against one or other of the Anglo-Saxon states. The Cymry from the Dee

to the Clyde were cut off from their brethren in Wales, and had to fight their own battles and govern themselves as separate states, Cumbria and Strathclyde. The king of Gwynedd, Iago, and many British princes fell in this battle. The Britons thus broken up into separate and isolated states still held much territory. Wales as we know it and adjoining districts, such as Shropshire and Herefordshire and parts of Gloucestershire and Worcester, formed a compact state divided into many subordinate kingdoms, but acknowledging the supreme authority of the over-king of Gwynedd. West Wales comprehending what we now call the West of England, Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, &c., was under the government of the Britons. In the north Cumbria, including the modern counties of Lancashire, part of Yorkshire, Westmorland, and Cumberland, was still a separate state ; Strathclyde, connecting Cumbria and modern Scotland, and joined often to Cumbria itself, remained independent of the Anglians. These territories were considerable and remained, though separate, for a long time under the Britons. They formed the Celtic fringe. The Britons, however, were seriously defeated at Chester, and their leaders considered that their dignity and power as a people were in danger, which their poets designated the crown of Britain. The supreme ruler, the over-king, or the Gwledig, was called the dragon, the Pendragon, a term probably derived from the Romans, who had the figure of a dragon on the standards of their legions and also on the standards borne before the emperors in time of peace. The Red Dragon was the favourite flag of Wales. The Britons held the Celtic fringe for several generations, except that portion called Galloway, which had long been occupied by the Picts, who, according to some historians, were a branch of the ancient Brythons, but according to others they were non-Aryans, belonging to the Aborigines of Britain.

The Northumbrians destroyed the city of Chester, but did not continue to hold it. Much of the territory belonging to it they seized and held. The Britons resumed their occupation of the city, but very little is known of its history for a long time, but it was still regarded as the capital of Gwynedd until it was captured by Egbert in the ninth century. The Northumbrians were drawn to other parts of Britain to contend not with the Britons, but with their brethren, the Anglo-Saxons.

CHAPTER XVI

RELIGION AMONG THE BRITONS AND THE ANGLO-SAXONS —THE BARDS OF THE SIXTH CENTURY

In a previous chapter it has been shown that the Christian religion was introduced into Britain in the second century, if not earlier, and that it spread through the country. We have not any precise accounts of its progress during the ages that succeeded, but certain great facts indicate to us that it must have penetrated through the country and assumed an organised form. The fact that British bishops took a part in the Council of Arles in A.D. 314, shows that the Church was then recognised as an organised body. And the fact that in the fourth century such a theologian as Pelagius, a Briton, was trained and educated at the great monastery of Bangor Iscoed, proves that mental and theological culture must have long been promoted in Britain. This British Church must, of course, be clearly distinguished from the Anglican, which was subsequently established among the Anglo-Saxons. It may be that the religion established among the ancient Britons was of a low type, considered from a practical and spiritual point of view ; but the same thing may be said of the earliest form of religion among most, if not all peoples, even among the peoples of modern times, converted by modern missionaries. The acceptance of the Christian religion as a creed and as a system of ceremonies does not at once regenerate a people morally and spiritually. The process of transforming the inner nature of a people and elevating their spiritual conceptions and aspirations must be slow and gradual, as indicated by the metaphor of the meal employed by Christ to describe the internal change of character effected by His gospel. The transformation of character and inward life, the moulding of the human spirit after the Divine model, is the ultimate result of Christian agency; but this result is only attained in individuals, and seldom, if ever, seen among an entire people.

The persecution under the Emperor Diocletian at the end of the third century is said by some writers not to have extended to Gaul, and consequently not to Britain,which was in the Gallic Prefecture. The governor of Gaul was then Constantius, the father of Constantine the Great, and he was opposed to persecution. He became emperor and died at York in the year A.D. 306. It is perhaps not absolutely true that the Diocletian persecution

did not extend to Britain, but the decree was very sparingly put into operation here. The noted case of St. Alban, who is called the proto-martyr of Britain, seems to indicate that the persecution did exist here. Alban was a British Christian, converted according to tradition by a Christian named Amphibálus, who had escaped from Caerleon in South Wales, to avoid persecution. He came to Verulam, then an important city in Britain, and was admitted into the house of Alban in that city. Alban was converted, and ultimately was put to death because he refused to sacrifice to the idols. The present town of St Albans is on a site near to the ancient city of Verulam, and has been called after the martyred saint. The tradition was placed on record by the venerable Bede, who lived and flourished A.D. 673–735, or about 400 years after the death of St. Alban. The entire narrative, as given by Bede is full of miracles, according to the custom of history written in the Middle Ages, and is largely mythical. Some historical critics have doubted whether there ever was such a saint as the Alban of Verulam, but this is to carry destructive criticism to extremes. There is sufficient evidence that there was such a man, and that he died a martyr at Verulam. Most of the remaining part of the story is mythical, and was fabricated in after times. The wandering Christian fleeing from Caerleon, named Amphibalus, was created by the mythical writers from the circumstance that Alban wore a long cloak, the Greek name of which was Amphibalus, hence the name of the saint preserved by St. Alban. For many ages the grave of the martyr was visited and miracles were reported to be performed. These are the ornamental portions of the mythical story which grew up in the course of time, and recorded by Gildas, and after him by Bede and Geoffrey of Monmouth. The fact of the martyrdom, however, remains as the residuum of the story. The time is usually given as A.D. 304 or thereabouts ; but the *Liber Landavensis* gives the date as A.D. 286, an error from some cause or other. Gildas also reports the martyrdom of two other saints at this time at Caerleon-on-Usk, named SS. Aaron and Julius. There is no further evidence for the martyrdom of these two saints until the ninth or twelfth century, but the fact of their death may be accepted.

The Diocletian persecution ceased in Britain in the year A.D. 305. These facts are mentioned here to show that in Britain at the latter portion of the Roman period Christianity not only existed but had sufficient vitality so as to produce men willing to die as martyrs rather than bow down and worship idols. In a few years after these martyrs died the first Council of Arles, in Gaul, was held A.D. 314 and, as previously described, it was attended by three British bishops, an evidence that the Christian Churches in Britain were then well organised according to the character of the times. The purpose of this council was to settle the dispute between the bishop of Carthage in Africa, Cæcilian, and the Donatists, who questioned the validity of his appointment. The particulars of this dispute need not be here described, but the fact

of the council indicates that the British Churches were of such importance as to be recognised by those of the Continent.

The persecution under Diocletian, though modified and limited in Britain, was severe in many parts of the Empire, but it was of short duration. During his reign of twenty-one years Christianity was tolerated by him for nineteen years, and he was finally led to persecute by Galerius, against his own inclination. His wife, named Prisca, and his daughter Valeria were Christians, and also were allowed to engage in Christian worship. Some of the officers in his palace were also Christians. There were in the Roman army many Christian soldiers, some of whom were put to death on the ground of disobedience to military orders under the influence of Christian principles. The persecution ceased in Britain in A.D. 305, but it was continued under Maximin in some parts of the Empire until A.D. 313, when it came to an end by the Edict of Milan, followed by peace and religious freedom. Britain, removed far from the centre of the Empire, enjoyed more freedom from disturbances at this period than other provinces, and had more prosperity. The religious persecutions which the countries near to Rome had to suffer in successive ages up to the last under Diocletian did not much affect Britain. The short and modified persecution under Diocletian was the only one that afflicted British Christians. In the quietness and general prosperity which Britain enjoyed under the "Pax Romana," when the Britons under their native princes submitted to Roman supremacy, the Christian religion made gradual progress among the native tribes during the third and fourth centuries.

In the closing part of the third century Carausius, a native of Holland, was "Count of the Saxon Shore" under the Empire, and amidst the troubles of the Empire he rebelled and set up as an independent ruler in Britain. He was tolerated for a while by the emperor, but in A.D. 291 Constantius was raised to the rank of Cæsar, which had the meaning of vice-emperor, and he was appointed to the chief command in Britain, with orders to restore the province to the Empire. In 292 he crossed over from Gaul, after having captured Gessoriacum or Boulogne from Carausius. In A.D. 293 Carausius was murdered by Allectus, who assumed the title of Augustus, and ruled over Britain. In A.D. 297 Constantius made a successful effort to subdue the usurper and recover the province. In A.D. 305 he was made Augustus, and in 306 he died at York. He was the father of Constantine the Great, by Helena his first wife. According to Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine, there were Christian officers in the household of Constantius. The tradition of the Britons was that Helena, the wife of Constantius and the mother of Constantine, was a native of Britain, the daughter of Coel Godsbog, who was king of Colchester, and that she was a Christian lady. Some doubt has been expressed on this point by Gibbon and others. Her name, however, was well known, and was popular during the Middle Ages of European history, as many churches, estimated at 72, were dedicated to her

memory in Britain. This fact, mentioned in the Calendar of the Anglican Church (1851), seems to indicate the connection of Helena with Britain and British Christianity.

Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor, spent some years in Britain and Gaul under his father Constantius. His mother, Helena, very probably taught him Christianity, and prepared him for the great step he took in declaring himself on the side of Christianity, and ultimately making it the religion of the Roman Empire. Helena was, however, divorced from Constantius, but lived to the age of eighty and died soon after her visit to Palestine. Constantine, when he became emperor, honoured his mother by conferring on her the title of Augusta. Constantine was born A.D. 272 and died A.D. 337, at Nicomedia, aged sixty-five. From all that can be gathered from his life, it seems that in Britain he was in association with Christians and Christian ideas, and that probably the early instruction of his mother was deepened and matured while here. On the death of his father Constantius at York, in the year A.D. 306, he was proclaimed emperor by the troops in Britain where he then was, and soon after he left Britain at the head of his troops, who followed him even to the gates of Rome where, after several battles, he maintained his position as emperor. This army consisted of men of different nations, and a considerable number of British youths recruited from the native population, were comprehended among them. These troops aided in the triumph of the emperor and of Christianity as the religion of the state. This seemed an indication that the Britons were then Christians and that Christianity was generally spreading in Europe and Britain. This country was thus the place where the spirit was fostered, destined to achieve the decisive victory for Christianity in Europe and the East. Constantine was not himself a model Christian in his private and public life; he was cruel towards his enemies. His defective conceptions of Christianity may be inferred from the fact that he postponed his baptism till a short time before his death, thereby ascribing to the mere ceremony a greater efficacy in the work of salvation than the acceptance into the soul of the gospel and the experience of the spiritual life which that acceptance produces during the earthly career. The age was, however, superstitious.

Constantine nevertheless seemed the providential instrument for overthrowing the pagan empire and erecting in its place a Christian state—Christian no doubt in a very imperfect sense. He was supported in this great work by the British Christian soldiers who formed an important part of his army. It is important here to note that the starting-place of his triumphant progress was Britain, where his Christian convictions were strengthened by the association of British Christians. It has been a matter of discussion whether any British representatives attended the great council of Nicæa which was called by Constantine to decide the important question of the Divine

nature of Christ, the result of which was the Nicene Creed. It does not seem likely that Constantine, formerly associated with British Christians, would omit Britain from the invitation to send representatives. One reason given for fixing upon Nicæa, a central position, as the place of meeting, as mentioned by Eusebius in his Life of Constantine, was that "the bishops of Italy and of the rest of the countries of Europe are coming." There is, however, only a probability of their presence, but no direct and positive evidence. There is no evidence of the presence of British bishops at the Council of Sardica or Sards, which assembled in the year A.D. 347 and condemned the Arians. There is, however, no doubt that British bishops did attend the Council of Rimini in Italy, or Ariminum, in A.D. 359, where the Arian emperor, Constantius, induced the assembly to sign a new Confession, which was ambiguously expressed. The great controversy in the Churches of this period was that relating to the person of Christ, the union in Him of the two natures, the divine and the human. This was decided at the great Council of Nicæa, but was revived again under the Arian emperor Constantius. The British bishops at the Council of Rimini, in common with others, were deceived, and under this decepfion were induced to sign a confession which virtually denied the Nicene Creed. There is, however, every reason to believe that the British Churches remained faithful to the Nicene dogma relating to the person of Christ and never denied it.

The controversy introduced by Pelagius was carried on among the British Churches in the fifth century. Pelagius, a Briton, whose British name was Morgan, and Cœlestius, supposed by some to have been a native of Ireland, by others of Scotland, or of Italy, became the leaders of a serious discussion on the doctrines of human depravity and personal freedom, as previously explained. Pelagius was trained in the closing period of the fourth century at the monastery of Bangor Iscoed. In the early portion of the fifth century those two men were monks in Rome and laboured to propagate the dogmas which afterwards came to be known as Pelagianism. Pelagius in A.D. 410 left Rome and visited Africa, and he and Cœlestius propagated their dogmas at Carthage in A.D. 412 and they were attacked by Augustine. Pelagius left Africa and visited Palestine. This heresy was condemned at the Council of Carthage in A.D. 412. The controversy, however, continued in Palestine and in Rome and elsewhere, and not least in Britain. It is, however, pretty certain that though Pelagius had a strong following in Britain, the British Churches as a whole never went over to Pelagianism, but remained faithful to the orthodox faith.

The danger to the British faith through the Pelagian controversy brought the British and the Gallican Churches into more intimate communion ; and the Britons asked for the aid of the Churches of Gaul to enable them to put down the new

heresy. The assistance could the more easily be rendered because the language of Gaul was even then Celtic and allied to that of Britain. The Gallic Synod appointed two bishops, Germanus and Lupus, to undertake the work. According to another account the Britons did not apply for Gallic assistance, but the mission was ascribed to the Roman bishop Cœlestine, influenced by Palladius. The two accounts may be substantially correct, but the former is the more probable. However, the two missionaries from Gaul came to Britain and successfully accomplished the object of their mission. According to Welsh tradition, Germanus was the son of Rhedyw, and his British name was Garmon ; thus he was of the Celtic race and allied to the Britons in race and language. The other missionary, Lupus, was called by the Britons Bleiddyn. They crossed over the channel in A.D. 429, in a storm which the superstition of the age, as recorded by Bede, represented as the work of the demons angry at such a holy and good mission. In those ages men peopled nature as full of invisible and evil demons who were the active agents in the government of the world. The modern scientific conception of natural causation was very imperfectly apprehended, hence the common invention of miracles in connection with the actions of good men. The two missionaries pursued their sacred work successfully. The Pelagian teachers were said to have avoided their controversial power until, seeing the people were turning over to the orthodox side, they ventured on one public discussion, which resulted in the signal triumph of the truth. This result was confirmed by the performance of the miracle of the opening of the eyes of a blind daughter of an official, called in the traditional account a tribune. In those times and through the Middle Ages miracles were common, and most legendary stories were ornamented with them. Ordinary cures were generally represented as supernatural, or the miracles were added in after times in the narratives framed by writers long after the events occurred.

St. Germanus did not confine his operations to argument, but as an old soldier took a part in aiding the Britons in a war against the Scots and Picts, who had invaded their country. The story, which is largely mythical, is that the British army had just been baptized and for the festival of Easter a church was built, a wattled building, supposed to be Llanarmon in Ial. The Scots and the Picts had advanced to the Vale of Mold, according to British tradition, where the battle was fought. St. Germanus put the place in a defensive condition and placed a number of men in ambush and were instructed at a certain signal to cry three times, with a loud shout, "Hallelujah." The pagans were thrown into panic and fled, many of them being swallowed up by the river over which they had crossed. In former times pilgrimages were made to this church, and the supposed field of battle was called Maes Garmon—the field of St. Harmon. How much of this story is real history cannot be determined, but much of it is legendary.

The first visit of St. Germanus lasted only two years, and he returned to Gaul after a successful campaign against the Pelagian heresy. In the year A.D. 447 he returned to Britain, accompanied by the Archbishop of Treves, whose name was Severus, in order to suppress entirely the Pelagian heresy which had been subdued but not destroyed by his first visit. The final result was the extinction of the heresy. The traditions of this second visit recorded by Nennius and others are largely mythical and need not be described here. The name of St. Germanus, called by the Britons St. Harmon, did, however, enter into the history of the British Churches. Many churches erected afterwards in Wales and Cornwall were dedicated to the memory of St. Harmon. Tradition associates his name with the foundation of the ancient monasteries of Llancarvan and Llanilltyd in Glamorganshire. The head of the latter, Illtud, and the bishop, Lupus, were appointed by him. This account is the creation of a future time and is unhistorical. The result, however, of his mission was the destruction of the heresy of Pelagius, which never again appeared as a power in British or Welsh history.

The history of the British Church for the next century is not clearly understood, being much mixed up with legendary matter. In the sixth century some important events occurred in connection with the British Churches. In the year A.D. 569 a synod was held at the place known as Llandewi-Brevi, in South Wales. The synod called Lucus Victoriæ, held in the same year, is supposed to be a continuation of the former. The object of this synod was probably to make regulations for the moral life of the clergy. The account given by some writers, including Rhyddmarch in his Life of St. David written in the eleventh century, that the purpose of the synod was to suppress Pelagianism, does not rest on any historical data, and seems inconsistent with previously stated facts that the suppression of this heresy took place in the fifth century by the agency mainly of St Germanus or St. Harmon.

There was another synod held in the year 601 at Caerleon-on-Usk, called according to the British Annals by St. David, the great bishop of St. David's. The object of this synod was probably the same as that of the previous one at Llandewi Brevi, the correction of the moral life of the clergy.

The history of the British saints written many ages after this period contains some indications of the condition of the British Churches of this age, but mixed up with much miraculous and legendary matter that not much solid and historical information can be gathered therefrom. There is one character, however, that stands out prominently in the sixth century, the substance of whose life is historical, the national saint of Wales, David or Dewi, the great bishop of the place called after him, St. David's. As indicated above, the life of this great Welshman was written by Rhyddmarch, who was the bishop of this see in the eleventh century. He was the son of Sulien, the wise

bishop of St. David's, and succeeded him in the bishopric, and was the father of another Sulien. In those days the celibacy of the clergy was not recognised in Wales. This life of St. David was the source of the materials used in all the other lives of the saint, but even this biography contains much that is legendary, the product of subsequent superstition, which must be separated from the real facts of the life.

The father of St. David was Sandde ab Ceredig ab Cunedda, and his mother was *Non*, or Nonna, the daughter of Gynyr, of Caergawch. In the style of Middle-age historians, his birth was surrounded by miracles, and when he was baptized by Belue, the bishop of the Menevensians, a predecessor of his own, a clear spring of water suddenly appeared and was used for the baptism. The water used for the ceremony was taken by the blind monk who held the child during the baptism and sprinkled his face three times and his blind eyes were opened and his other bodily defects were cured. But tales of this description, contained in Rhyddmarch's Life of St. David, appear to us as silly inventions, but they came into existence in a period of superstition when historical criticism was unknown, and when mythological invention took the place of real history. More miracles were ascribed to his early education. Afterwards David came under the instruction of Paulinus, a disciple of St. Germanus, who was a bishop leading a life pleasing to God, in a certain island. This Paulinus taught David for many years until he became a scribe. During this time Paulinus became blind, and his disciple, then recognised as very holy, touched his master, and immediately he was cured of his blindness. The narrative states that David refused to look at the face of his master, declaring that during the ten years he had studied the Scriptures under him he had not looked upon his face. This, of course, is pure nonsense and monkish invention. This Paulinus, Pawl Hen in Welsh, was a North Briton, who founded the monastery of Ty-gwyn, or Whitland, in Carmarthenshire, and it was here that St. David studied under him.

The life of St. David after the events described above was a wandering one. He is described in the legendary history relating to him as founding twelve monasteries and visiting the town of Glastonbury, and there building a church—no doubt a wooden building, afterwards turned under the Anglo-Saxons into a stone church. There is much myth in the history of this place in Somersetshire, but it was undoubtedly in British times famous as a religious shrine, and became more famous under Saxon control. It became a place of pilgrimage for Welshmen, Irishmen, and Englishmen, and the monastery established there was richly endowed even by Ina, the king of the West Saxons. The saint after a time returns to his own country, Menevia, and makes strict regulations for the life and conduct of the monks of his monastery. They were not to lead idle lives, but they should devote themselves to manual labour, by which they were to procure the necessaries of life for themselves and their congregation, teaching

them the lesson of St. Paul, that they that will not work shall not eat, and that idleness was the mother of vices. In addition to manual labour the monks were to devote themselves to prayer, meditation on Divine things, and works of mercy. The fame of David spread far and wide, and kings, princes, and many others came to his monastery, including Constantine, then king of Dumnonium. The history tells us that St. David, under the direction of an angel, went to Jerusalem in company with Teilo and Padarn, and that his journey was aided by his supernatural gifts and his ability to speak the languages of the countries through which he passed. The mythical account also records that on his return he took an active part in the suppression of the Pelagian heresy which had revived among British Christians. This, however, is inconsistent with other more reliable historical statements, that this heresy was suppressed in the fifth century. This new suppression by David was an addition invented by traditional writers in order to magnify the services of St. David to the British Church.

The most striking event in the history of St. David as narrated by ancient writers and embodied in Rhyddmarch's Life of St. David is the selection of him as bishop of Menevia. The graphic and somewhat dramatic account given need not be here described in detail. A synod was assembled at a place then called Brefi, afterwards Llandewi Brevi in South Wales. There were assembled 118 bishops, and a multitude of presbyters, abbots, and others, including kings, princes, laymen and even women. Paulinus was also present. St. David was not present at first, but at the suggestion of Paulinus (Pawl Hen), the synod appointed St. David to be not only bishop but the metropolitan archbishop. David was in private engaged in holy contemplation, and when the deputation arrived and invited him to attend the synod and accept the appointment, he refused. Then two distinguished men are sent to him, namely, Daniel and Dubricius. He received them hospitably, and proceeded with them to the synod, performing on the way the miracle of raising to life the dead son of a widow. Then he went to the synod, and was appointed bishop. Much of the above account is mythical. It is now generally admitted by competent critics that there was in the sixth century in Wales no archbishop, and that consequently there was no appointment of St. David to the office of metropolitan. This was the invention of a later age, and was transferred to St. David by priestly writers as a matter of course.

The intelligent reader will observe that the number of bishops attending the synod was 118, a number extraordinary according to our modern conceptions. It is obvious that these bishops could not be diocesans. The fact is that the conceptions of the office and functions of bishops were not as rigid in those days as in ours. The primitive meaning of bishop as an overseer or superintendent (ἐπίσκοπος) was then recognised more fully than now. Men who had no dioceses and who occupied the position of abbots of monasteries, or positions of superintendents in monasteries, were

called bishops. Canon Pryce, in his book, "The Ancient British Churches," p. 166, remarks in a footnote that bishops were generally considered essential to the right governing of large monasteries as well as to the salvation of their inmates. Such an order existed in Wales and in Ireland. The spread of Christianity in Britain was effected mainly by settlements of Christians made in various parts of the country. These settlements were, in many cases, monasteries, or institutions in which the brethren lived together, laboured for food, and had all things in common. From these communities missionaries went forth to evangelise the people, and returned again to their common home, and over each such community there was commonly a bishop. This was the case in the time of St. David.

St. David, as bishop of Menevia, became a man of great power. He was a very devout and holy man, and exercised much influence on the moral and religious life of the people, among whom vice was prevalent. He was a bishop who did much to spread Christianity among the mass of the people of Wales. After a long life of useful activity St. David died in peace on the 1st of March, A.D. 601, according to the most approved chronology.

Although in those distant times the majority of the bishops were non-diocesan in Wales, there were from an early period diocesan bishops. Caerleon, in Monmouthshire, was an important fortified place in the time of the Roman occupation, where the noted second legion had their headquarters. This city became in early times the seat of an episcopal bishop. The bishop of this see was present at the Council of Arles in Gaul A.D. 314. This was the only see in Wales during the time of the Romans. There were others in Britain—now England—such as York and London, both of which were represented at the Council of Arles. This ancient see was ultimately subdivided into the sees of Llandaff, St. David's, and Llanbadarn, or rather superseded by them. In the sixth century there were six bishoprics in Wales, but some did not continue long, as Llanbadarn and Llanafan Fawr. These two finally were absorbed in the see of St. Davids. At Menevia there was before St. David's time a religious establishment, and, according to some doubtful accounts, there was a bishop there, but most accounts represent that the bishopric proper was founded by St. David himself in the sixth century. This see originally comprehended the principality of Dyfed, including Pembrokeshire, Caermarthenshire, and the south part of Cardiganshire.

Llanbadarn, a place near Aberystwith, became the seat of a bishop in the sixth century. This see embraced the ancient principality of Caredigion, also the northern portion of Cardiganshire, parts of Brecknockshire, Radnorshire, and a small portion of Montgomeryshire. The founder of the see was St. Padarn, supposed to have come from Brittany originally in A.D. 512, bringing with him a large number of monks—according to the legendary history exceeding 800. In the eighth century the see was merged in that of St. David's.

Llandaff became a see some time in the sixth century. Its founder and first bishop was Dubricius, who is said to have lived in the year A.D. 612. In the Lives of this saint there are many unreliable statements and even contradictions. His remains were removed from the island of Bardsey to Llandaff in the year A.D. 1120. The second bishop of this see was Teilo, a disciple of St. Dubricius. This see originally comprehended the principality of Gwent, and ultimately the kingdom of Morganwg and some neighbouring districts. These two sees—St. David's and Llandaff—have survived through all the fluctuations of time to the present, and superseded for South Wales the smaller sees of Llanbadarn Fawr and Llanafan Fawr.

In North Wales there have continued from ancient times to the present two bishoprics—Bangor and St. Asaph. Bangor was founded in the sixth century by Deiniol Wyn, or Daniel, who died in the year A.D. 584 and was interred in the sacred island of Bardsey. This see in ancient times belonged to the kingdom of Gwynedd. The see of St. Asaph was also called by the name of Llanelwy, was founded in the sixth century, and the reputed founder was Kentigern, but much uncertainty belongs to his life. This see belonged in ancient times to the principality of Powys.

The above remarks show that the sixth century was an important period in the history of the British Church—a period of consolidation after the destructive conflicts between the Britons and the Anglo-Saxons and a time of organisation. At the close of the sixth century an important event occurred which became the beginning of the movement which resulted in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity and the contact of the Roman with the British Church. I refer, of course, to the mission of Augustine and his companions to England. The story is well known : how Gregory, a distinguished abbot of a monastery in Rome, about A.D. 580, or more probably 585–588, was passing through the slave market and was attracted by the fair appearance of some of the young slaves. "Who are these?" he inquired, and he was told they had come from Britain, and on further inquiry he learnt that they had come from the province of Deira, this, or something like it, being the Latin rendering of the British province of Deifyr, one of the two provinces into which the kingdom of Northumbria was then divided. Mistaking the meaning of the name, Gregory said, "Deira—plucked from God's anger," &c. The name of their king was given as Ella, and Gregory, again playing on the word, exclaimed, "Alleluia shall be sung in Ælla's land." This account is probably largely mythical, the poetical interpretation of the facts of history by ancient writers. This Gregory, however, became the bishop, or pope, of Rome, in A.D. 590. In the year A.D. 595 he determined to send missionaries for the conversion of the English, and selected Augustine and several companions who belonged to the monastery to which Gregory belonged and indeed had founded. The monks started to pass through Gaul, but were terrified by the accounts they had received, and returned.

Then they were induced by Gregory to begin the journey again. Through the influence of Gregory, the rulers in Gaul were induced to protect the missionaries on their journey and to supply them with interpreters. Augustine and his companions knew Latin, but not the languages of Britain. They arrived in Britain in the year A.D. 597, and landed at Ebbsfleet in the Isle of Thanet, the same place where Hengist and Horsa landed nearly 150 years previously. This place belonged to the kingdom of Kent, and the reigning king was then Ethelbert. His queen, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of the Franks, was a Christian, and she was, by agreement, to follow her own religion and to have a chaplain, whose name was Luidhard, bishop of Senlis, and the old church of St. Martin at Canterbury was assigned as the place where he was to officiate as chaplain. Ethelbert was thus, to some extent, prepared for Augustine's mission. The missionaries and King Ethelbert met by arrangement under an oak-tree in the Isle of Thanet. The missionaries received the king with all the ceremonial show they could. Ethelbert did not understand Latin, and Augustine did not know English, but the priests from Gaul became the interpreters. The result of the interview was that the king would not promise to become a Christian, but his people could please themselves. The missionaries were, however, invited to the capital of his kingdom, Canterbury, where they were allowed to conduct their worship in the building previously given to the chaplain Luidhard—the church of St. Martin. In a few months Ethelbert became a convert to Christianity, and many of his subjects followed his example and submitted to baptism. The kingdom of Kent soon became nominally Christian. We must not suppose that the people were internally changed, personally converted by a genuine transformation of nature and life. The first change in a whole people is external, superficial, and nominal. The other, the spiritual change, comes after, and is personal and individual. The king gave to Augustine another building, which became the Christ Church and the seat of his bishopric.

Augustine having secured his position in Kent, turned his attention to the Britons who had been Christians for four centuries before his arrival. He expected that they would submit to his authority as the representative of Rome, and that they would assist him in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. With the aid of Ethelbert Augustine directed his steps across the territory of the West Saxons to seek an interview with the British Christians. This first interview is generally represented as having taken place at Aust Passage, on the Severn, but according to Green, in his work, "The Making of England," pp. 224–5, it took place somewhere near Malmesbury. He interprets the words of Baeda, "*in confinio Hevicceorum et occidentalium Saxonum*," as "on the border *between* the Wiccii and the West Saxons." The settlers in Gloucestershire and Worcestershire were called then Wiccii, and were in alliance with the Britons against the West Saxons. The name survives in the Worcestershire of modern times. The

bishop of Worcester was called by Theodore the bishop of the Wiccii, and included Worcester and Gloucester. For these reasons Green places the first interview near the modern Malmesbury. This first interview, however, was a failure.

The second interview between Augustine and the Britons was at a place called after Augustine's Oak. There is some confusion in the description of the place of the two meetings. The second interview must have taken place somewhere in or near North Wales, as Augustine was met by seven bishops, and many men of learning from the noted monastery of Bangor Iscoed, in Flintshire. On the way to the meeting the Britons consulted a monk of reputed wisdom who lived alone. His advice was that if the strangers showed humility by rising at their approach, they were to listen submissively to them, but if they rise not they were to despise them. Augustine did not rise, and he was not favourably received by the Britons. Some portion of this narrative may be legendary, but the legend was probably founded on the haughty and overbearing conduct of Augustine as representing the supreme claims of the Roman pontiff.

The questions which Augustine brought before the British bishops were three specially: the time for celebrating Easter, the administration of baptism after the manner of Rome, and to assist in the conversion of the heathen Anglo-Saxons. Augustine was willing to tolerate some British customs if they would submit on the three points mentioned, but this they refused. The British Church had hitherto no connection with the Roman. It was derived originally from the Church at Lyons and Marseilles, which was more Oriental than Roman. The time for celebrating Easter was not of much consequence, and probably did not much affect the minds of the Britons, but they saw no reason for changing their customs at the dictation of the Roman strangers. The time for celebrating Easter and the mode of administering the sacrament of baptism they had received from their ancestors, and they had no organic connection with Rome from the beginning. They refused to submit to the Roman authority represented by Augustine. To aid the missionaries from Rome in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons was distasteful to the Britons. For a hundred and fifty years the warfare had been carried on between them, and much cruelty and bad feeling had been exhibited. The demands of Augustine were all rejected and the interviews were failures. The British Church remained independent for centuries after the time of Augustine.

The precise date of these interviews is not given, but they must have been within certain limits. Augustine arrived in the year A.D. 597, and he died probably in the time from A.D. 604 to 607. Gregory died in A.D. 605, and Augustine soon afterwards. The last interview must, therefore, have taken place early in the seventh century.

The sixth century was an important period in the history of the Britons in a literary point of view. The first native historian

flourished about the middle of this century in the person of Gildas, who has been described in a previous part of this work. The century, however, was remarkable for the rise and activity of the first group of ancient bards known to British history. The bard who is generally placed first in the list of poets who flourished in this century is Aneurin, who lived A.D. 510–580. His great poem, the Gododin, was intended to describe the conduct of the Cymry in the north, which culminated in the disastrous battle of the Cattraeth. This has also been described on preceding pages. A contemporary of Aneurin was the renowned Taliesin, who devoted his life to the composition of poems. He was never a soldier as Aneurin, but a bard by profession. Mr. Thomas Stephens, in the "Literature of the Kymry," p. 4, thus describes Taliesin: "His poems show more skill in composition, finer ideas, bolder images, and more intense passion than any poet of the same age. The historical value of the Gododin is greater; poetical merit belongs more exclusively to Taliesin. There are nearly [seventy-seven] eighty pieces attributed to him, most of which belong to a much later date; but the 'Battle of Gwdrystrad,' the 'Battle of Argoed Llwyvain,' the 'Battle of Dyffryn Gwarant,' and some of the 'Gorchanau' seem to be genuine." If we were able, it would be contrary to the purpose of this work to give even a description of the seventy-seven poems ascribed to Taliesin, who lived from A.D. 520 to 570.

The bard who bore the name of Myrddin, or Merlin, flourished from A.D. 530 to 600. To him have been ascribed six poems, which are regarded by the critics as mostly not genuine. His character was that of a prophetic poet. Stephens, p. 199, thus describes him: "It is commonly asserted that the Merddin, the son of Morvryn, or Merddin the Wild of the Welsh bards, is a different person from the Merddin Emrys, or Merlin Ambrosius, but there are many reasons for rejecting this assumption. Both Merddin ab Morvryn and Merddin Emrys lived about the same time; both lived in the same locality, the north of England; both were conversant with the same facts—the doings of the Strathclyde Britons and their subsequent fortunes; both were diviners; both had more than ordinary attributes; both predicted the same events in nearly the same order; and most probably both names represent but one person." This opinion of Stephens is probably correct. Some objections have been made to the conclusion, which we cannot here discuss.

Another great bard of this period was Llywarch Hen, who lived from A.D. 550 to 640, according to the traditional account. A dozen poems are ascribed to him and pronounced to be genuine. Thus Thomas Stephens ("Literature of the Kymry," p. 2) describes them: "The poems of Llywarch Hen are undoubtedly old, and, referring to an age of whose manners we have few other transcripts, are very valuable, nor are they destitute of poetic excellence. Though a warrior and treating of warriors, his *forte* does not lie in heroic poetry; his descriptions of manners are happy, and the

incidental allusions are strikingly illustrative of the age; but his chief power lies in pathetic lamentations and his elegies have many fine sentiments. He cannot, however, take a high rank in bardic literature." This bard, like many other great men of the British race of this period, belonged to the north, the Strathclyde of the ancient Britons. Among his poems was an elegy on Urien Reged, the distinguished prince and warrior of the North Britons. There were other bards of less importance in the sixth century among the Cymry, which we need not here describe.

CHAPTER XVII

THE BRITONS IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY

The great conflict between the Anglo-Saxons and the Britons continued for more than a century and a half from the invasion in A.D. 449 until the beginning of the seventh century. The struggles were not even ended at the beginning of the latter period. The hostility continued for many generations, but the decisive battles had been fought and the Britons had been defeated, driven more and more to the west and the hills of the north or north-west. The contest was the most severe and the most prolonged in Europe, and showed that the ancient Britons were a brave and heroic people. If they had been more united and not divided into clans, tribes, and small principalities, and had been organised into a compact and homogeneous nation, probably the Anglo-Saxons would never have subdued them. They suffered the fate of all peoples, ancient and modern, who, under the false conceptions of liberty and independence, divided themselves into fragments without any effective organised unity. This was the characteristic of most peoples in ancient times, hence they fell under the power and domination of more organised peoples. This lesson was applicable to the inhabitants of Britain and Ireland in successive periods of their history. The lesson has been better learnt in modern times when disjointed peoples in Germany and Italy have formed themselves into powerful and united nations—powerful mainly because of their organised unity. The mere sense of kindred or of nationality has given some measure of courage and common sentiment, but without organised unity the courage has spent itself in isolated brave efforts which have had no lasting result. It is now too late to act on ancient principles and to pine for provincial semi-independence at the expense of an organised governmental unity which is necessary to the greatness and independence of an empire.

In the early part of the seventh century the Britons were numerous, and they still occupied much territory, but they were divided and severed from each other. The battle of Deorham, as previously shown, resulted in the separation of Wales—as we now call it, then called North Wales—from West Wales, or the ancient Dumnonium which comprehended Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, and a portion of Dorset. The West Saxons came as a wedge between

the two branches of the same people and prevented them ever after uniting their forces in defence or aggression. The people of West Wales remained for a long time in semi-independence and in the use of their Celtic tongue, but were finally subdued. The battle of Chester in A.D. 613, between the Britons of Gwynedd and the Northumbrians, severed the Britons of North Wales from their brethren in the north, Cumbria and Strathclyde. These northern Britons maintained a semi-independence for several ages, struggling against the Northumbrians but driven to the hills of Lancashire, Westmorland, and Cumberland, where they continued the conflict. They were, however, cut off from the Britons of North Wales, not in feeling and language but in geographical position. The Britons were thus in the early part of the seventh century broken into fragments and occupying a large extent of territory but wanting in unity. They were numerous, distinct from the Anglo-Saxons, and round the coast from Cornwall to Scotland in the occupation of much of the country. They were, however, in a disjointed condition and hopeless of ever securing national independence.

Such was the condition of the Britons on the large fringe of the country. But what had become of the Britons in the south, the east, and the centre of the country? The usual explanation of the majority of English historians has been that the Britons were driven to the west or exterminated. The conquest of Mid-Britain has been hid from us. Green in "The Making of England," p. 74, states that not a single record has been left of the progress of the peoples whom we find settled at the close of the century (the sixth) in the districts of our Nottingham, our Leicester, and our Northampton, or on the headwaters of the Trent." The general result is of course well known—the conquest of the country—but the details of the conflict have been hid from us. In reference to the absence of British unity, he states (p. 227): "In Mid-Britain the Romanised cities may have retained their supremacy. But everywhere there was the same tendency to faction and severance. Save at moments of either period, no one chieftain united the native tribes under his sway; no one city or league of cities gathered the towns around it. A crowd of petty princes jostled and battled over the surface of the west; while each town isolated itself within its own district of subject country and only joined its immediate neighbours for defence on the approach of the Englishman."

Such writers as Arnold of Rugby, Freeman, and even Green, have contended that the Britons were nearly all swept from their native soil, either driven to the mountains of the west and the north, where they formed separate states or exterminated. Green thus expressed this idea: "Not a Briton remained as subject or slave on English ground. Sullenly, inch by inch, the beaten men drew back from the land which their conquerors had won; and eastward of the border-line which the English sword had drawn, all was now purely English." There is much reason for the

conviction that this was not the case, that whilst the warriors and their followers gradually retired from the country, a large number of the inhabitants remained and became subject to their Anglo-Saxon conquerors. It is not probable that during the wars between the Anglo-Saxons and the Britons the total British population would follow the retreat of the warriors to the western and northern mountains. This would hardly have been possible. The aged men and women, the children, the sick and dependent, could scarcely from time to time have left their native villages for a pilgrimage to the hills, especially from the southern and central districts of the country. Many of the warriors did retire to the extremities of the country, and some did emigrate to their kinsmen in Gaul, Brittany, or Armorica ; but in all probability most of the inhabitants remained and submitted to the conquerors. This would be the natural or usual course of events. The natives who thus remained would become the labourers and the serfs of their masters, and the women would be taken as wives. The Anglo-Saxons were mostly males. Some of their women accompanied them, and others followed, but the vast majority were men, and the British women were taken to supply the deficiency. The records of these transactions for the midland districts have perished, but there remained some indications as to other parts of the country which point to the conclusion at which we have arrived.

In the code of laws framed by Ina, king of Wessex, there is a recognition of the rights of the Welsh, and provision was made for securing them justice. This king ascended the throne of Wessex in A.D. 688, he reigned thirty-seven years, and died in the year A.D. 725. He was remarkable for wisdom and justice, and tried to promote the happiness of all his subjects. He encouraged intermarriages between the Welsh and the Saxons, and granted them the enjoyment of the same laws and privileges. There is one expression in the laws which implied that some of the Welsh were slaves or serfs. It is thus : "*Si servus waliscus anglicum hominum occidat*" ("If a Welsh slave should kill an Englishman"). This code of laws was framed for the people of Wessex, which then included Somersetshire, Wiltshire, and Dorset. The language implied that at least in this kingdom in the early part of the eighth century there were many Britons or Welsh subject to Ida, and intermarriages were encouraged between them and the Saxons. Thus the present inhabitants of this large district have descended from a mixture of the two races to some extent. The great king Egbert of Wessex was the first to be recognised as the king of England, or Bretwalda, or the over-king of Britain, in A.D. 827. He died in A.D. 837. The Britons had rendered assistance to the Danes, and in revenge Egbert imposed upon them a heavy tax and as a token of their subjection. This seems an indication that the Britons were not exterminated within his dominion. Further, the greatest of the Anglo-Saxon kings, Alfred the Great, saved the Saxon nation from the barbarism of the Danes, and secured the

progress of civilisation and education in England. He endeavoured to conciliate the Britons. The existence of a considerable number of Britons in his kingdom is evident from his will, in which the districts now known as Devon, Somerset, Wilts, and Dorset, are called Wealh Cynne, or districts where the Welsh abounded. He died October, A.D. 901. There is thus every probability that the ancient Britons remained to a large degree in their native districts in subjection to the Anglo-Saxons. Of course all admit that in the Celtic districts proper—Wales, West Wales, Cumbria, and Strathclyde, the Britons were the mass of the population. These districts formed a large part of Britain, and the inhabitants constituted a considerable portion of the people of Britain.

At this period Wales proper was divided into three portions or kingdoms. These were denominated Gwynedd, Powys, and Deheubarth or South Wales. Gwynedd was roughly North Wales, bounded by the sea from the river Dee to Aberdyfi, and on the west and south-west by the river Dyfi, which divided it from South Wales and in some places from Powysland, and on the south and east it is divided from Powys, sometimes by mountains and sometimes by rivers, till it came to the river Dee again. This kingdom in old times was divided into four parts, namely—(1) Mona or Anglesey, containing three cantrefs and six commots ; (2) Arfon, four cantrefs and ten commots, our Carnarvonshire ; (3) Meirionydd, three cantrefs and nine commots ; this was equivalent to our Merionethshire ; (4) Berfeddwlad, five cantrefs and thirteen commots. This kingdom extended into Cheshire and included the ancient city of Chester. This city was for a while regarded as the capital of Gwynedd, but the palace of the king was at Aberffraw, in Anglesey or Mona. The city was destroyed by the Northumbrians in A.D. 613, but it remained in the possession of the Britons of Gwynedd for two centuries after this event. In the year A.D. 835 King Egbert of Wessex, who had become the over-king of England, invaded Wales, laid siege to Chester, captured it, and made it an important place on the Saxon frontier.

The second kingdom in this period was Mathraval, or better known as the kingdom of Powys. The boundary is thus described in the Blue Book on the Land in Wales (1896) : " To this kingdom belonged the country of Powys, and the land between the Wye and Severn, which part had upon the south and west South Wales with the rivers Wye and Tywy and other rivers, upon the north Gwynedd, and upon the east the marshes of England from Chester to the Wye a little above Hereford." The above descriptions of Gwynedd and Mathraval are taken from Sir John Price's " Description of Wales " (oldest MS. 1559). From the above we learn that Powysland itself formed the most important portion of the kingdom, but not the whole. The land between the Wye and the Severn was not in Powys proper. Powys itself was divided into two parts—Powys Fadoc and Powys Gwenwynwyn. The former contained five cantrefs and fifteen commots,

the latter five cantrefs and twelve commots. The land between the Severn and the Wye belonging to this kingdom contained four cantrefs and thirteen commots and extended to the boundary of Breconshire. It formed the central and eastern part of Wales, of which Montgomeryshire was perhaps the most central portion. It included a portion of Shropshire. Shrewsbury was called in British times Pengwern, or Head of the Alder Groves. It was also designated Ymwythig, and is so called in Welsh even now. This old town was for many years the capital of the principality of Powys. Brochwal, the king who took part in the battle of Chester, resided here. The present name, Shrewsbury, is Saxon, and is derived from Scrobbes Byrig or Shrubborough. The conquest of the town by King Offa destroyed it as the capital of the kingdom of Powys. The seat of the government was then transferred to a place called Mathraval, near the present village of Meifod in Montgomeryshire. The only remains of this ancient seat of Welsh royalty is a farmhouse bearing the name. The site of the ancient castle where the princes resided may be traced by a careful and intelligent observer. It was probably restored by Robert de Vipont, a favoured baron of King John. In the chief church of the place in olden times the princes and chief men of Powys were interred, including Madoc ap Meredydd ap Bleddyn ap Cynfyn, who died in the year 1160. So Pennant relates in his "Tours in Wales."

The third ancient kingdom of Wales was called Deheubarth, or Dynefawr, and embraced South Wales in the modern sense of the term. This kingdom was divided into six parts. The first was Caredigion, our Cardiganshire, which contained four cantrefs and ten commots. The second was Dyved, or Dimetia, and corresponded to Pembrokeshire. The third was Caermarthenshire, containing four cantrefs and fifteen commots. The fourth was Morganwg, with four cantrefs and fifteen commots, corresponding with Glamorganshire. The fifth was Gwent, with three cantrefs and ten commots, and coincided with Monmouthshire. The sixth division was Brycheinog, and represented our Breconshire, having three cantrefs and eight commots. The boundaries here indicated must be regarded as approximately but not absolutely correct. The division of Wales into counties was made long after the formation of these ancient divisions, but was obviously on the same basis.

The divisions into cantrefs and commots are met with in the course of ancient British history. They were evidently very ancient, going back to the remotest time. In Welsh tradition, embodied in Welsh ancient laws, the primitive division of the country is ascribed to a monarch called Dyfnwal Moelmud, who reigned in Britain 400 years B.C. No reliance can be placed on this account, which is purely legendary. The division into cantrefs and commots was very ancient and was independent of the fluctuating boundaries of kingdoms and principalities. The word *cantref* denotes one hundred trefs or towns, and agrees in

meaning with the Saxon *hundred*, supposed to signify one hundred townships or settlements. The commot, or cwmwd, was a smaller division. The cantref was considered to contain two commots, but this was not the case generally. Many cantrefs contained three or four commots. The commot in later times became a manor. The commot had a court of its own where law and justice were administered. The cantref had a court with a wider administration and superior to that of the commot. Some writers, such as Herbert Lewis in "The Ancient Laws of Wales" (1892), contend that the cantref did not mean one hundred trefs. Wales in length, including Monmouthshire, is from 113 miles to 135, and its breadth is 110 to 34 miles, omitting fractions. Of course it is much broader in some parts than in others. The area of the thirteen counties includes 5,121,013 acres. In the ancient method of calculation the then kingdoms of Wales contained fifty-five cantrefs and one hundred and fifty-six commots, according to a very ancient MS. called the "Llyvr coch Hergest," but not free from the errors of transcribers.

The boundaries of Wales were, of course, in the seventh century indefinite. The divisions of South Wales extended to some extent into Gloucestershire and Worcestershire and Herefordshire. Powys embraced much of Shropshire, and Gwynedd a part of Cheshire.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SEPARATE BRITISH STATES IN THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES

It has been shown in a previous chapter that the Britons were severed from each other by the battle of Deorham in Gloucestershire in the year A.D. 577 and by the battle of Chester in the year A.D. 613. By the former the Britons in West Wales were cut off from their brethren in Wales in our sense, and by the latter the Britons of Cumbria and Strathclyde in the north were cut off from their brethren in Gwynedd and Powys. This does not of course imply that there was no individual intercourse between the Britons of these separated regions, but that the organic and political connection was broken—the West Saxons in the one case, and the Northumbrians in the other, coming in like a wedge between them. The disjointed members of the British community still cultivated the family feeling, sympathised with each other, and for many ages maintained their distinctive nationality, their language, and Celtic peculiarities. It may be interesting and instructive to ascertain and describe the history of these separated regions peopled by the same race.

The part of the country in the west cut off from Wales proper was called at this time West Wales, and what we now call Wales was then known as North Wales. It embraced what we now call the West of England. In very ancient times it was designated Dumnonium. West Wales comprehended Cornwall, Devonshire, and most of Somersetshire and Dorsetshire. The boundary on the English side changed continually, removed westward until the time came when the whole was conquered and united to England. The West Saxons gradually made progress in the seventh century over the Britons. For some time after the great battle of Deorham, when they defeated the Britons, the West Saxons made no progress, but declined, and lost some of the territory they had gained in Gloucestershire in the Severn valley; but, restrained in the direction of the north and the midlands by the rising power of Mercia, they directed their energies against the Britons of West Wales. Under Cenwal, or Cenwealh, the West Saxons marched against the Britons and defeated them at Bradford-on-Avon in our Wiltshire. In the year A.D. 658 they defeated the Britons again in Somersetshire

at a place named the Pens, and drove them from the district of the River Parret. The kingdom of West Wales was now much reduced by the severance of the districts on the borders of the Saxons, but yet it remained a considerable state. The British king who reigned over the Britons of Dyvnaint at the beginning of the eighth century was Geraint, the third of that name who had ruled over West Wales. The name Dyvnaint, from which our Devonshire is derived, is probably from Dumnonium—the land of the Dumnonii—and denoted the country of West Wales as then understood. This king, Geraint, was very powerful, and reigned over the country extending from the shore of the Bristol Channel in Somersetshire to the extremity of Cornwall. It is also recorded that he exercised considerable influence over the Britons of South Wales on the other side of the channel. In the year A.D. 710 Ina, the great king of the West Saxons, advanced against Geraint, and after a severe battle defeated him. By this victory more territory was taken from West Wales. The districts along the river Tone, comprehending Crewkerne and Ilminster, and also Taunton, or the town of the Tone, were added to the West Saxon kingdom. By this successful campaign of Ine, or Ina, Somersetshire, the land afterwards occupied by the Somersaetas, from which the name of the county is derived, was added to the West Saxon kingdom, thus reducing the kingdom of West Wales to the country now known to us as Devonshire and Cornwall. Ine was a wise ruler, and as previously shown, he framed a code of laws by which the rights of the British or Welsh were provided for, implying thereby that in this region of the west the population was mixed, consisting of Britons and Saxons. The great king Ine, in the year A.D. 726, gave up his kingly reign and retired on a pilgrimage to Rome, where he spent the remainder of his life in religious meditation, after having ruled over the West Saxons thirty-eight years. The supreme power seemed to have passed from the West Saxons to Mercia under the king Ethelbald. He overran the West Saxon country, captured the town of Somerton, and thus ended the war. At the head of his combined forces Ethelbald marched against the Britons in the west, and of course defeated them. The particulars of the wars in which the Britons of the west were involved have not been fully recorded. It is reported that Rhodri Maelwynawg, a British king, crossed the Severn to aid the Britons of West Wales who had been attacked by the successor of Ine or Ina. The progress of the English conquest in the west, however, continued. The West Saxons gained their former supremacy by their victory over the Mercians at Burford A.D. 754, and then they recommenced their work of pushing the Britons farther and farther to the west or subduing them. During the latter half of the eighth century the remainder of Dyvnaint, or Devonshire, was conquered. There remained, however, Cornwall over the river Tamar. The great king of Wessex, or the West Saxons, was Egbert, who began in A.D. 802, and he proved

himself the most powerful of the Anglo-Saxon kings, and became supreme, being recognised as the king of all England, or the over-king. The Welsh of Devon and Cornwall and the English who had settled in Devon were frequently at war, and in A.D. 815 Egbert marched his army into Cornwall, where the Britons still had a native government. The war continued for eight years, and ended in the defeat of the Britons and the supremacy of the West Saxon king. The duration of this war for eight years showed once more the courage and the valour of the ancient Britons. The conquest of Devon and Cornwall by Egbert did not entirely destroy every form of native government. The Britons were allowed to govern themselves in due subjection and subordination to the Anglo-Saxon king. When the Danes appeared on the western coast in the year A.D. 835, the Britons allied themselves with them against the West Saxons, but Egbert defeated the united forces at the battle of Hengestton. In the year A.D. 926 the Saxon king Athelstan drove the Britons from the city of Exeter, and compelled them to migrate to Cornwall over the Tamar. Up to this time, by some pacific arrangement, the Britons and the Saxons had lived together in Exeter, the one race occupying one side and the other race the other. The peace was no doubt often disturbed, and the Britons did not willingly submit to the Saxons. To prevent continued disturbances Athelstan compelled the Britons who were unwilling to submit to leave the city. The remnant of the West Wales kingdom was brought under the subjection of the Saxons, and afterwards was completely annexed to the English crown under the Norman power. The inhabitants of Cornwall proper remained after their conquest a purely British race. The Cymric language, or a dialect of it, continued to be spoken by the common people up to the eighteenth century. In the sixteenth century it was the general language of the people, and in the time of Queen Anne it was confined to a few villages in the western part of the county. It continued still longer, and became extinct as a spoken language about the year A.D. 1777. Many words of the language survive in the speech of the common people. The Cornish people exhibit still many of the qualities of their Celtic brethren in Wales. They are nearly as purely Celtic in blood as the Welshmen in Wales. The names of places in the county still—the *pens* and the *tres*—show the Celtic derivation of the people. Of all the names of places in Cornwall, 80 per cent. are purely Celtic or Cymric. The remaining names, 20 per cent. are Saxon. The county of Devon anciently belonged to the kingdom of West Wales, and the inhabitants were British. The Saxons settled largely in Devon after the Conquest, but alongside with the Britons or Welsh. The expulsion of the Britons from Exeter by Athelstan in the tenth century was mainly a military measure, affecting those who were unwilling to submit to the laws and the government of the Saxons. The quiet people, who were probably the majority, settled down and remained in the country. Up to the reign of

Queen Elizabeth the Cymric language continued to be spoken in some remote parts of Devonshire, especially those bordering on Cornwall. In his "Britannia," Camden mentions that in the year A.D. 961, Ordulph, the earl of Devonshire, built at Tavistock an abbey, where lectures were established on the English language for the purpose of preserving it, showing thereby that the Welsh language was so much in use as to endanger the language of the Saxons. The assistance rendered to the Danes in the west by the Britons caused Egbert to impose a heavy tax on them. In these districts it is evident that many of the Britons continued to reside side by side with the Anglo-Saxons. The greatest and the wisest king of the Anglo-Saxons was Alfred the Great, who flourished in the latter half of the ninth century. He was a man of wisdom; he conciliated the Britons and induced many of the Welsh princes to acknowledge his supremacy. By this conciliatory policy Alfred was able to pursue his work of conquest over the Danes, and to save the Saxon nation from the barbarism of their enemies, and to secure the progress of civilisation and education in England.

Another great branch of the British people was in what we now call the North of England. The Britons of the north and the north-west passed through a similar experience to that of their brethren in the west and south-west. Those who resided in the interior of the country were conquered and subdued or driven out; but those who possessed the mountainous portions and the sea-coasts were able to maintain their independence for some centuries after those of the interior had been subdued. In this they were aided by the brave warriors who refused to submit. The annals of these Britons have largely perished, and we therefore have no detailed account of their struggles—only fragments which enable us to give a mere outline of their history. The struggles of the fifth and sixth centuries we have already described. The results of those struggles were the formation in the north of two British kingdoms; the one bore the name of Cumbria and the other Strathclyde. They were sometimes united in one state and sometimes separated. The kingdom of Reged was also a small kingdom, but generally united with Strathclyde. The kingdom of Cumbria was long a British state of importance. The name is derived from the people, the Cymry—the country of the Cymry—from which also is derived the name of the county of Cumberland. The boundaries of these ancient states cannot be precisely defined; probably they never were very definite, and changed from time to time according to the fortunes of war. The kingdom of Cumbria, roughly speaking, comprehended the districts now known to us as Lancashire, Westmorland, Cumberland, and the western part of Yorkshire, probably as far as Leeds. The capital of Cumbria was for a long time Carlisle, or Caerluel, British in origin and name. In the course of time this city lost its importance as the ancient capital of Cumbria. The kingdom of Strathclyde—the valley of the Clyde—comprehended the districts of Dumbarton, Renfrew, Dumfries, and

probably the counties of Peebles, Selkirk, and Lanark. It thus formed the northern portion of the British kingdom of Cumbria and Strathclyde. The capital of this British state was on the Clyde, called by the Britons Alclwyd—on the Clyde—and by others Dumbarton, or the fortified town of the Britons—*dum* being a British word that denotes a fort. This town retains its name, and the ruins of the castle are still there. It was largely situated in Scotland, extending from the Clyde to Cumberland.

The history of these two ancient British states sometimes united in one is very imperfectly known. They were frequently at war with the Anglian state of Northumbria. The northern Britons were not always at peace with themselves. A great battle was fought amongst themselves in the latter part of the sixth century at a place called Arderydd on the banks of the Esk about nine miles from Carlisle, according to some historians, but in the opinion of others the place was in Lanark, identified as Airdrie. The victorious Briton was Rhydderch. The result of this battle was that Carlisle no longer was the capital of Cumbria. The victorious Rhydderch fixed his headquarters on the Clyde, the Alclwyd already mentioned. This Rhydderch was a Christian, and he induced Kentigern, the bishop of St. Asaph, to return from Wales and undertake the primacy of that district as bishop of Glasgow. The king of Bernicia, the third son of Æthelfrith, Oswin, was called to his throne in the year A.D. 642, and gradually he acquired the other kingdom of Northumbria, Deira, A.D. 652, and became sole monarch of Northumbria, and he was acknowledged as supreme over England. A great part of the Welsh, of the Picts, and the Scots of the north-western border bowed to his supreme authority, and owned it by paying tribute to Oswin. "The supremacy of Northumbria over the Britons of Cumbria and Strathclyde was restored. The Picts and Scots of the north were forced to pay tribute" (Green). "For a long time after Oswin's victory, the Cumbrians, like the other Kymry, remained under English domination ; but at length, in the year 686, Oswin's son, Ecgfrith, the king of Northumbria, was defeated and slain at Dun Nechtain, supposed to be Duninchen in Forfarshire. The Angles only retained their power over the Picts of Galloway and the Cumbrians south of the Solway, together with the city of Carlisle, which Ecgfrith shortly before his death had given to St. Cuthbert with some of the land around it. The Cumbrians north of the Solway became independent and had kings of their own again, of whom one is recorded as dying in 694 and another in 722. But the Picts of Galloway continuing under the yoke of the Northumbrians, the king of the latter managed in 750 to annex to Galloway the district adjoining it on the north and west, which was then a part of the land of the Cumbrians, though it may long before have belonged to the Picts" (Rhys, "Celtic Britain," p. 146).

Mention is made in British history of King Cadwallon as blockaded in the island of Glannog, the modern Priestholm or Puffin Island near Beaumaris. Then Cadwallon escaped to Dublin.

This was in the year 629. He afterwards turned up in the north and rebels against Eadwine of Northumberland, and joined Penda of Mercia in a battle at a place called Heathfield, probably Hatfield near Doncaster, in the year 633, in which Eadwine fell and his army was cut to pieces. In the year following, 634, Osric, the son of Eadwine, king of Deira, attempted to besiege Cadwallon in the city of York, but was slain by the Cymry. Northumbria then for one year came under the domination of Cadwallon. Then Oswald collected an army and attacked and defeated Cadwallon at a place called by Baeda Hefenfelth. This was near the present town of Hexham and the Roman wall. This was in the year 635. Cadwallon, according to the Welsh Chronicle, met his death in this battle. The successor of Cadwallon was his son Cadwaladr, who continued the alliance with Penda against Northumbria, then united again under Oswald. A battle took place at a place called Maserfeld, but differently named in the Welsh Chronicle. This occurred in the year 642. Oswald was slain and his army defeated.

The Britons of the north were often cruelly treated by the Angles of Northumbria. It is, therefore, not to be wondered at that they united with the Danes against the common foe, though the Danes, when they were in power, were, if possible, more cruel than the Anglo-Saxons. In the year 870 the Danes, under Olaf and Hingwar, destroyed Alclwyd or Dumbarton. Sometimes the Danes were hostile and cruel to the Britons, and at other times they allied themselves with them against the Anglo-Saxons. Many Danes settled in the kingdom of Cumbria and became amalgamated with the natives. In the time of King Alfred the Danes under Halfdene ravaged both kingdoms.

Under Edward the Elder—A.D. 901–925—the son of Alfred, the crowns of Cumbria and Strathclyde were subject to England, but not incorporated into England, but the yoke was not long endured. They again united with the Danes against the Anglo-Saxons, and the confederates came into collision with the Saxons under the powerful king Athelstan at the battle of Brunnaburgh, or Bamborough, in the year 936. The king of Cumbria and many British chiefs, Constantine the king of Scotland, and the Danish commander Olaf were present in the battle and were signally defeated. The Danes were dispersed, the Scotch retired to Scotland, and the Britons to their mountain fastnesses in Cumberland and Westmorland and the region of the Clyde. Athelstan died in the year 941, and was succeeded by his brother Edmund the First. During his reign the Danes of Northumbria revolted, and they were again aided by the Scotch and the Britons. Edmund marched against them and subdued them. He conquered Cumberland from the Britons and conferred it on Malcolm, king of Scotland, on the condition that he protected the north from Danish incursions and did homage to the English crown. This occurred about A.D. 945. The destruction of life and property among the Britons in this war was very considerable. In the year 946 Edred became

king of England, and the Danes of the north, aided by Malcolm, king of Scotland, again revolted, but they were subdued, and Malcolm was obliged again to do homage for Cumberland. In the year 1030 we find that Duncan, nephew of Malcolm II., king of Scotland, was king of Cumberland or Cumbria, for in that year Canute, the Danish king of England, made an expedition against both and conquered them. During the troublesome times that followed we know but little of the Britons in the north. It is known that during the latter period of the Anglo-Saxon rule the tributary kings of Cumbria and Strathclyde were summoned to the Saxon Witenagemote. The Norman Conquest changed the condition of these states. The kingdom of Strathclyde was annexed to Scotland, and has continued to the present day, and Cumbria was absorbed into England. This change in the government of these states did not, however, turn the inhabitants into Scotchmen and Englishmen. The people were still Britons or Welshmen, and their nationality became lost only in the course of generations. Strathclyde was more closely connected with Scotland in the twelfth century, when David became king in the year 1124; and in the battle of the Standard in A.D. 1130 the Cumbrians formed a distinct battalion in the Scotch army. For a long time the Scotch kings claimed the earldom of Cumberland. The Britons of that district were thus a separate people though subject to a foreign power. The influence of time and the gradual mixture of the different races—Britons, Angles, and Danes—would slowly obliterate the national peculiarities, and ultimately the Britons would be lost in the English and Scotch peoples. In the fourteenth century Edward I. abolished their laws and usages and brought them under the English government. Cumberland had been anexed to the English crown by Henry III. in the year 1237, but many British laws and peculiarities were allowed to continue until removed by Edward I. in 1307.

The British or Cymric language continued longer than the laws, and died only by the slow process of English advancement. In the counties which comprehended those ancient British states the words of the old language linger in the dialects of the common people and the designations of places. The British people were the inhabitants of the large district from the Clyde to the Mersey, and their language was spoken in this district probably up to the fourteenth century. The present inhabitants of this region are a very mixed people, descended from Britons, Angles, Saxons, Danes, and Norwegians ; but there is every reason for believing that the largest element of the mixture, apart from very modern additions, came from the ancient Britons.

We now pass from the outlying British states of the west and the north to Wales, the centre of the ancient British people during their struggle with the Anglo-Saxons. The materials for a full and minute account do not exist. We left our former account of Wales proper soon after the battle of Chester in the year 613, when the Britons of Wales were cut off from their brethren in the

north. The different branches of the race had still a community of feeling and some intercourse, but no organic connection. Wales remained a separate country governed by various princes acknowledging generally one over-king or Gwledig. As previously shown, there were three great divisions—Gwynedd, most of North Wales; Powys, most of Central Wales; and Deheubarth or South Wales. The precise boundary of Wales during the period under review of course changed from time to time, but it extended beyond the present line and included parts of Cheshire, Shropshire, Herefordshire, and Gloucestershire. The history of Wales during this period is largely bound up with the history of the kingdom of Mercia, which adjoined it, and suffered most from its power, especially under Offa. The West Saxons adjoined South Wales, and were a source of trouble and loss during their time of great power, as shown on preceding pages. A story is told of the wars between the Britons of South Wales and Ceolwulf, the king of Wessex. There was much conflict between them in the early part of the seventh century. The Welsh king, Tewdr of Morganwg, abdicated in favour of his son Meurig, who was a profligate man. The West Saxons in the year 610 marched a powerful army into that part of South Wales, then called Gwent, corresponding mainly with Monmouthshire. The Britons were badly defeated under their feeble king Meurig. Tewdr had retired to end his days in peace and religion at Tintern after the fashion of the age. The Welsh went to implore the old king to come to their assistance. After some hesitation he complied with their request, placed himself at their head, and drove the invaders across the Severn. The old man, however, died in the hour of his victory. Four years after this event the Britons suffered a great defeat from the West Saxons under their king Cynegals at a place called Beandune, supposed to be Bampton, whether in Devon or Oxfordshire is not known, when they lost over two thousand men. They were probably engaged in aiding their brethren in the West Wales kingdom. The Britons of South Wales suffered much from the inroads of the Saxons of Wessex. Dimetia or Dyfed at one extremity, and Gwent at the other, were ravaged by the invaders; but they did not conquer the country. In North Wales Cadwaladr ruled peacefully for the greater part of his life. This was after the British defeat at the battle of Chester and extending beyond the middle of the seventh century. He was called Cadwaladr the Blessed. He was distinguished as the builder of churches and endower of monasteries, and as the protector of those who fled from Saxon oppression. On these accounts he probably received the saintly designation. He was the son of Cadwallon, and he continued the alliance with Penda, the Mercian king, formed by his father against Northumbria, which oppressed their brethren the Cymry of the north. "In the struggle between the Cymry and the Angles after the battle of Chester the kings of Gwynedd doubtless considered that both their dignity and their power were at stake. These are spoken of in Welsh literature as the

crown of Britain ; for the Dux Britanniarum had not only passed into the gwledig of Britain, but the latter had come to be spoken of as king or monarch of Britain. This last title would seem to have begun to get into use before the middle of the sixth century, when Gildas described Maelgwn as *insularis draco*, or the island dragon, the island being probably Britain, and not Mona, as is sometimes supposed ; and here we have an early instance of the habit so common in Welsh poetry of calling a king or great leader a dragon, as when a mythical gwledig of Lower Britain is always called Uthr Bendragon, or Uthr Head-dragon, the reputed father of King Arthur. The Welsh words are *draig* and *dragon*, which, like the English dragon, take us back to the Latin *draco* and *draconis*, a dragon, and these in their turn to the Augustan era of the Roman Empire, when dragons began to figure on the standards of some of the legions and to be borne before military leaders, etc." (Rhys, "Celtic Britain," p. 134).

The following from the same work (p. 138) may be appropriate here. "The disgrace the Kymry felt at losing the crown of Britain, whatever that somewhat indefinite expression implied, was probably nothing in comparison with their bitterness at being robbed of one piece after another of their country. We have already alluded to Eadwine annexing Loidis and Elmet to his own kingdom of Deira ; but far more fatal to Kymric independence was the appropriation by the Angles of the district of Teyrnllwg, described by Welsh tradition as reaching from the Dee to the forests of Cumberland and the neighbourhood of the Derwent, which was once the boundary of the diocese of Chester : the tract consisting of the level part of Cheshire and South Lancashire must have been taken from the Kymry soon after, possibly before, the battle of Chester." The two districts mentioned were situated in Yorkshire : the former, Loidis, gave the name to the town of Leeds, and the latter, Elmet, to Berwick-in-Elmet and Sherburn-in-Elmet. They were two small but important states in the ancient kingdom of Cumbria. During the reigns of Cadwan, Cadwallon, and Cadwaladr, kings of Gwynedd, the wars between the Northumbrians and the Cymry were almost continuous, and the final results were the defeat of the latter, the reduction of their territory, but not the conquest of Gwynedd. The king, Cadwaladr, died in the year 664 from the great plague that raged in Britain, and during two visits swept off large numbers of the inhabitants, including kings and princes. For some time after the death of Cadwaladr not much is recorded of the history of the Britons. The state of Northumbria declined in power and that of Mercia increased, and the history of Wales for some time was inseparable from that of Mercia. In the latter part of the seventh century Herefordshire, then a principality, was conquered and annexed to Mercia. Rodri Maelwynawg plays an important part as king of Gwynedd. Several victories by the Britons were gained during his reign, though not by him personally—two of them in Glamorganshire. Ethelbald of Mercia was defeated in South Wales, which he had

invaded in the year 728 or thereabouts. In the year 743 Cuthred of Wessex and Ethelbald of Mercia united in the invasion of South Wales and defeated the Britons. Some years after Cuthred and his successor in Wessex, Cynewulf, carried on war against the Britons of South Wales and slew many of them. Ethelbald of Mercia also invaded Powys and Gwynedd. In the year 754 or 755 Rodri died, and was succeeded by his son Cynan Tindaethwy. In these wars the frontier of Wales was shifted one way or other, according to the fortune of war. It was not, however, until the time of the great king of Mercia, Offa, that the boundary of Wales was materially and permanently removed westwards. Offa began his reign over Mercia in the year 755, and he continued till the year 794, when he died. He succeeded Ethelbald and inherited many of his difficulties, but being a great and warlike king he overcame them all and raised Mercia to the highest position among the Anglo-Saxon states. He invaded Wessex and Kent and conquered them. In A.D. 792 he murdered Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, and seized his kingdom. He carried on a long war with the Cymry of Wales, especially during the last twenty years of his reign. The borderland between Mercia and Wales, the region of the Severn, was often the scene of bloody conflicts. He invaded the territory belonging to the Britons, and they in retaliation ravaged his country, and ultimately succeeded in extending his boundary and seizing a considerable part of British territory. The kingdom of Powys, previously described, embraced a portion of Shropshire, and Shrewsbury, then called Pengwern, was its capital. Green thus describes the conquest over the British kingdom of Powys. "Pushing, after 779, over the Severn, whose upper course had served till now as the border-line between Briton and Englishman, Offa drove the king of Powys from his capital, Pengwern, whose older name its conquerors replaced by the significant designation of the Town in the Scrub, Scrobsbyrig or Shrewsbury, and carried the Mercian border to the Wye. The border-line he drew after his inroad is marked by a huge earthwork, which runs from the mouth of the Wye to that of the Dee, and which still bears the name of Offa's Dyke. A settlement of Englishmen on the land between this dyke and the Severn served as a military frontier for the Mercian realm. Here, as in the later conquests of the Northumbrians and of the West Saxons, the older plan of clearing the conquered from the soil was abandoned. The Welshmen no longer withdrew from the land which the English won ; they dwelt undisturbed among their conquerors ; and it was probably to regulate the relations of the two races on the border he had won that Offa drew up the code which bore his name" ("The Making of England," p. 419–20).

Church remarks (p. 145) that the dyke was constructed for the protection of the English settlers. This could only have been a small part of its design, as it extended far beyond the district occupied by them—from the Wye to the Dee. It was a kind of

fortified boundary for the kingdom of Mercia against the Britons of Wales.

The kingdom of Powys, which suffered most from the wars of Offa, was previously an important state of Central Wales; and having now lost its capital, Pengwern, and much territory, the king and government removed to a new capital in Montgomeryshire, the centre of the state. This capital was called Mathraval, near the present village of Meifod. The only remains of the place now is the name of a farm. The remains of the dyke, *Clawdd Offa*, may still be seen in several places. The boundary of Wales made by Offa's Dyke has roughly continued to the present day, of course including Monmouthshire. The British inhabitants remained for the most part on the English side of the dyke, and the modern dwellers have largely descended from them. The county of Hereford was annexed before the time of Offa. No one can study the peculiarities of the people residing in the western portions of Cheshire, Shropshire, and Herefordshire, without coming to the conclusion that they have descended to a great extent from the ancient Britons. Chester, the capital once of Gwynedd, has never ceased to possess the character of the Britons so far as the people are concerned, though the material remains remind us of the Romans. Shrewsbury, the capital of Powys, has always borne a Welsh aspect. The populations of these and other districts in these modern times are very mixed, but the Cymric element has been a considerable source of the present inhabitants.

The Welsh literature of this period consists of the poems of the bards, few in number, inferior to those of the sixth century; also the history of Nennius—"The History of the Britons." The date of this book has been disputed: some ascribe it to the eighth century and others to the tenth. The general opinion now is that it was composed in the eighth century. It contains much valuable information mixed with a great deal of superstition and legendary matter. The native historians are Gildas of the sixth and Nennius of the eighth century. The Venerable Bede belonged to this period. He was the Anglo-Saxon historian. His "Ecclesiastical History of England" is very valuable and is generally esteemed as a trustworthy source of English history. He was born in the year 673; he was for twelve years a student in the monastery of Wearmouth; he was a monk and a priest. His "Ecclesiastical History" was published about A.D. 734, the year before his death. He wrote from the Anglo-Saxon point of view, and he was not always fair to the Britons or the Welsh. It is, however, the most valuable history of the period.

CHAPTER XIX

THE ANGLO-SAXON HEPTARCHY

THE Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain came in separate detachments, landed at different places, attacked and conquered different British tribes, and settled in different parts of the country. They came under various designations—Jutes, Saxons, and Angles—from separate districts of the Germanic continent, but all belonged to the same Teutonic race. In the course of their long conflict with the native Britons, extending over more than a century and a half, they succeeded in gaining distinct settlements, which in the course of time became separate and independent states. The destructive wars that ensued and continued were not confined to the British tribes. Gradually the new states extended and came to each others borders. Separate interests sprang up and disputes in reference to boundaries and territory arose which led to wars among themselves. One state or another of the Anglo-Saxons became dominant and claimed to be recognised as supreme. The fortunes of war changed and the supreme power passed from one state to another. At one time the West Saxons, at another the Angles of Northumbria, and then the Angles of Mercia, became supreme. The gradual course of events brought the states nearer to each other, and ultimately there was established a kind of confederation, in which one was acknowledged as supreme and the monarch became the over-king of the entire country. The final result was the creation of a national unity in which the over-king became the king of England.

The states that made up this unity were seven, and the form of government has been designated the Heptarchy—the government of seven kings, in which one was supreme. The great state of Northumbria was often divided into two—Deira and Bernicia—and again united into one ; on this account the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms have been sometimes counted as eight and designated the Octarchy. It is, however, more convenient to keep to the ordinary designation of the Heptarchy. In a previous chapter the invasions of the Anglo-Saxons and their wars with the Britons and the establishment of the several states have been described. In this chapter we shall confine our narrative to the formation of the Heptarchy and the rise of England as the one state in the land,

and its relation to the Britons. In doing this we shall have to go over to some extent the same ground as in a previous chapter.

The first invaders were the Jutes under their leaders, Hengist and Horsa, who came in the year A.D. 449. They came in three ships, landed at Ebbsfleet in Kent. According to the Saxon account, they were invited by Vortigern, the British king to aid in resisting the Picts and the Scots who were then very troublesome. They were promised the Isle of Thanet as the reward of their services. They succeeded in conquering the Picts and Scots and entered upon their reward. Hengist became king of Kent and reigned after his landing about forty years, dying in the year 590. His son Eric or Esc succeeded him and died after a reign of twenty-four years, during which he extended the kingdom of Kent. This first kingdom continued as a separate state for the period of 372 years, and afterwards yielded to Egbert, king of the West Saxons, who became the over-king, or, as some represent, the king of England, though the formal title was not yet recognised. By the defeat of Boldred, king of Kent, in the year 823, the first kingdom of the Saxons as a separate state came to an end and became subject to Wessex under Egbert. The progress of this great king in the conquest over the Britons of the west has been already described.

The second Saxon settlement was effected in Britain by Ella in the year 477, accompanied by his three sons, Cymen, Wlencing, and Cissa. The kingdom of the South Saxons was the result of this invasion. The Britons were defeated, the old Roman fortified town of Anderida, now called Pevensey, was captured and the British garrison slain. This occurred in the year 490. Ella reigned as king over the South Saxons until the year 519, when he died, and was succeeded by his son Cissa, after whose name the capital of the kingdom, Chichester—Cissa and ceaster—was called. This kingdom did not exist long as a separate state. After Cissa it became dependent on the West Saxons, and in the year 725 it was conquered and absorbed.

The third invasion of the Germans was in the year 495. The most powerful and numerous of the Saxons proper came under the leadership of Cerdic and his son Cynric. They landed at the mouth of the river Itchin near Southampton. After a few years Cerdic was strengthened by another body of invaders under the leadership of one called Port. Another addition was made by the arrival of a band led by nephews of Cerdic, whose names were Stuf and Wigtgar. The union of all these forces ensured the triumph of Cerdic over the native Britons. The Isle of Wight was one of the territories acquired by Cerdic. In the year 519 the battle at Cerdices-Ford, or Charford, in Hampshire, resulted in the defeat of the Britons and the assumption of the royal title and power and the creation of the kingdom of the West Saxons. During the reign and progress of Cerdic, the renowned Briton, king and hero, Arthur of the Dumnonii, arose. He was for many ages afterwards celebrated in the Bardic poems as the most

renowned of patriots and warriors. His great qualities were doubtless much exaggerated and his heroic deeds embellished by the Bards. He succeeded in arresting the progress of the Saxons, but failed to maintain the independence of the Britons. The numbers and skill of the Saxons and the disunion of the Britons prevented his final success. The death of Arthur destroyed the hopes of the western Britons. Cerdic himself died in the year 534, and he was succeeded by his son Cynric, who, after making fresh advances, died in 560 A.D. The capital of the kingdom of the West Saxons was Winchester. The kingdom continued as a separate state under nineteen kings, and then under Egbert became the chief, and ultimately the sovereign state of England. The history of the West Saxons from the beginning of the ninth century, when Egbert became virtually king of England, is substantially the history of England.

The fourth kingdom of the Heptarchy was called the East Saxons, and embraced the districts of Essex, Middlesex, and part of Herts. It arose in this way. In the year 527, or about that time, two small settlements from the Saxons proper were made. The invaders consisted of two bands—the East Saxons and the Middle Saxons, as they were afterwards distinguished. The Middle Saxons invaded the district now known as Middlesex, having London as its principal place. The East Saxons settled in the district of Essex and part of Hertford hire, which included the ancient town of Camulodunum or Colchester. The first band seized London and the second Colchester. These two bands subsequently united, and the kingdom of the East Saxons was established. The names by which we know the various states were given to them, not at first but afterwards. The chief associated with these invasions was called Ercenwine. The Britons of Essex were of the tribes generally designated the Logrians, from which the Welsh came to call the English country south of the Humber Lloegr. The capital of this kingdom was London. This kingdom was never strong, and was much subject to the neighbouring kingdoms. It continued, however, in nominal independence under fourteen kings for a period of about 280 years, and then in the year 823 it was seized by Egbert, king of the West Saxons and of England.

The most numerous of the three great Germanic tribes that invaded Britain and conquered its inhabitants was that of the Angles, after whom the entire country came ultimately to be called England—the land of the Angles. They proceeded from their own country on the Baltic and landed on the eastern coast as described elsewhere. The leader of the first band of the Angles was Uffa, who landed in the east of the country. The people divided themselves into two and occupied two different but contiguous districts, afterwards called the north and the south folks, from which our counties of Norfolk and Suffolk have derived their names. The kingdom of the East Angles was formed by these peoples, which embraced our counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and parts of Cambridge

and Huntingdon. The first king was Uffa. The date of the formation of the kingdom is generally given as 575. The invasion of the country took place earlier. A branch of the same people also captured Lindum, our Lincoln, the ancient Roman colony. These conquerers gave themselves the name of Lindiswar, as "dwellers about Lindum." The name still survives in the Lindsey district of Lincolnshire. They were originally a separate state, but afterwards were united to the kingdom of East Anglia. This kingdom, under many fluctuations, continued to exist until the ninth century, though precise dates relating to the Angles cannot be relied upon. The king Ethelbert was murdered by the cruel king of Mercia, Offa, in the year 792. He then overran the East Anglian kingdom and took possession of it, but died two years later. The kingdom was, however, conquered by Egbert, king of the West Saxons, in the early part of the ninth century. In the year 870 Edmund was the vassal king, and he was slain by the Danes.

The sixth kingdom of the Heptarchy was Northumbria. The men who formed this state were Angles. Under the leadership of Ida they landed in the year 547, according to the Saxon Chronicle. The place of their landing was Bamborough, in Yorkshire, which they immediately fortified and made the starting-point in the conquest of Northumbria. This kingdom in its united condition comprehended the modern counties of York, Northumberland, and Durham, and when the Britons were entirely conquered, Lancashire, Westmorland, and Cumberland. The first king was Ida. In the year 560 the eldest son Adda became king of Bernicia, and Ella became king of Deira—the two states into which Northumbria was sometimes divided. Ella became in the year 580 the sole king of Northumbria, the two kingdoms having united after the reigns of Glappa, Heodwulf, Freodwulf, and Theodoric, in Bernicia. He continued as sole monarch for seven years, when Ethelric became king of Bernicia in 588, and Edwin in 590, became king of Deira. Northumbria fluctuated, sometimes it was one state and at other times two. In 617, under Edwin, the two were united under the name of Northumbria. The chief cities of this important state were Flamborough and York. The latter city was made the capital of Northumbria by Edwin or Eadwine. This great king ascended the throne of Northumbria in the year 617. Under his government this state rose to its highest pitch of glory and power, and in fact became supreme, and Edwin was acknowledged as the over-king of England, the supreme ruler of the entire country. He was a wise and just, as well as a powerful, monarch, and secured in his kingdom peace and order. The fortunes of war, however, change, and Edwin perished in a war with the Mercians under the king Penda, and the supreme power departed from Northumbria. The kingdom continued as a separate state, sometimes divided and at others united, under a succession of kings, generally powerful but sometimes conquered, until the year 841, when it was annexed by Egbert, the king of the West Saxons and of England.

The last of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms was Mercia, called such because it was founded on the borders of the British dominion of Wales and West Saxons. The German word for border was *merk*, a boundary. As shown in Chapter XIII., it was formed by the Angles of the north and the east under their leader Crida at the close of the sixth century, probably about the year 586. It was at first dependent on Northumbria, but in the year 626 it was constituted an independent state by that great but cruel monarch, Penda. It was a large kingdom embracing what we now call the Midland Counties, having as its capital Leicester, though this fluctuated. It gradually rose to be one of the leading Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, especially under the noted king Offa, who made the dyke that formed the boundary between Wales and England. The last king of Mercia was Ceolwulph, who began his reign in the year 874 and was deposed by the Danes in 877, when the state was merged into England. The state had, however, been conquered by Egbert of Wessex in 828, and it became subject to Wessex.

The conquests of the Anglo-Saxons over the Britons were effected by the separate states formed by the invaders. The most serious struggles took place from the landing of the Jutes in 449 to the battle of Chester in the year 613, when the British nation was severed into several fragments, each of which had to contend alone against the enemy. We have on previous pages described the contests. When the Heptarchy was merged into the one state—England—the Britons of the west—West Wales—had been conquered by the West Saxons, and the Britons of Cumbria and Strathclyde had been subdued by the Northumbrians. The Britons of Wales still maintained their independence within a restricted area, but even they had to pay tribute to the king of Mercia.

Under Egbert, the great king of Wessex, the whole of England became one state. He had brought West Wales—Devonshire and Cornwall—in 825 into submission. The kingdom of Mercia, once so strong under Penda and Offa, had fallen into discord and anarchy in the early years of the ninth century. Several Mercian defeats were suffered by the East Anglians and the West Saxons. In the year 828 the West Saxons invaded Mercia, Wiglaf fled, and Egbert overthrew the Mercian state. The great kingdom of Northumbria, through the agency of their theigns, peacefully bowed to the supremacy of Wessex, and acknowledged Egbert as their overlord. The kingdoms of East Anglia, Northumbria, and Mercia were not entirely destroyed, but for a time became tributary and subject to Wessex. The name England was not probably at once given to the one supreme and united kingdom, but the reality came into existence, and this was afterwards called England.

There was at an early time a title given to some great Anglo-Saxon kings called Bretwalda, the meaning of which has been disputed. It is generally agreed that the latter part of the word, *wald*, means *wielder*, and most have interpreted the former part

Bret to denote Britain, the whole word meaning Britain-wielder, the ruler of Britain, not of one state but of the entire country. Others affirm that *bret* or *bryt* denotes *broad*. The Bretwalda would be the wide ruler, the over-king or supreme ruler of the entire country. This seems to be the opinion of Green, Church, and Freeman, but Rhys contends for the former opinion. Apart from the derivation of the word, all are agreed that the title denotes supreme ruler in some sense. Bæda states in his "Ecclesiastical History" that seven princes at various times held the chieftainship of the English kingdoms. These were Ella of Sussex, Ceawlin of Wessex, Ethelbert of Kent, Redwald of East Anglia, and Edwin, Oswald, and Oswin of Northumbria. The words used by Bede were *imperium* and *ducatus*, empire and dukedom being the English equivalents. In the English Chronicle this supremacy is designated the Bretwalda, and in the ninth century Egbert of Wessex is designated the eighth king that was Bretwalda. This was the Saxon word that denoted the supreme power held by certain kings over other kings and states—the over-king—which culminated in the establishment of one king of England. The great king of Wessex, Egbert, became the Bretwalda, and succeeded in the ninth century in creating a united kingdom ruled by himself and his successors. The extent of the Bretwalda's power differed in different ages. The first of this kind mentioned by Bede was Ella of Sussex, whose power did not probably extend farther than Kent outside Sussex, his own kingdom. Egbert, however, did exercise a real supreme power over the whole country. Under Egbert "the whole English race in Britain was for the first time knit together under a single ruler."

Egbert handed down the one supreme and united kingdom of England to his successors. He died in 837, and was succeeded by his son Ethelwulf. *His* youngest son, Alfred the Great, on the death of his brother Ethelred, ascended the throne in the year 871, when he was only 22 years of age. He became the greatest and the best king that the Anglo-Saxons ever had. His life was written by his former tutor Asser, in a book which he called "Annals of the Deeds of Alfred the Great." This Asser was a Welshman brought up at St. David's. His name given in Latin was Asserius Menevensis. He was a monk of St. David's, and afterwards probably abbot and bishop. He became the tutor and the intimate friend of Alfred, and therefore well qualified to write his life. He died in the year 910, nine years after his great pupil; and it is from his book that we know most of the life of Alfred.

Alfred was born in the year 849 at Wantage in Berkshire. He was the youngest of five sons of his father, King Ethelwulf. His mother was Osburga, daughter of Oslac, the royal cupbearer, who was of the Jutish race, descended from Stuf, one of the two brothers who received the Isle of Wight from Cerdic. His mother died when he was seven years of age. His father married again for his second wife Judith, who of course became the step-mother. His father was specially fond of his youngest son, and

on the death of Ethelred, Alfred ascended the throne. He was good looking and of an amiable disposition, but of a feeble constitution. He suffered from disease, said to be epilepsy; this probably shortened his active life, for he died in the year 901 in the 51st year of his age, and was interred at Winchester. His education in his earliest years was neglected by his parents until Asser was appointed his tutor. He was, however, a promising pupil, and soon showed a strong love of learning. He not only encouraged learning in an age of great ignorance, when very few persons could even understand the Service of the Church or knew how to read; he himself became a learned man. He wrote several books and translated others, such as "The General History of Orosius," "The Spaniard," from the Latin, and "Boethius' Consolations of Philosophy," written in the fifth century. The knowledge involved in such translations must have been considerable in such an age as the ninth century. He was also the translator from the Latin into English of the "Ecclesiastical History" of the Venerable Bede. It has been frequently said that he was the founder of the Oxford University, but this is now considered a fiction. He did promote the formation of schools in many places, and one at Oxford, which may have been the germ of the university. In the midst of the distractions of public life and of war he was able to pursue his studies, and when he was nearly forty years of age he began to study Latin, and soon became master of the language so as to be able to translate from it important books into English.

Before Alfred's time codes of laws had been framed by Offa of Mercia, Ina of Wessex, and Ethelbert of Kent, but he framed a new and more complete code, taken by wise selection from the other codes. The administration of law and justice was then of the greatest importance, when even the nobles and the judges were ignorant, corrupt, and unscrupulous. He effected a great change in this respect. He was the first king in England to place the finances of the state on a sound and equitable basis, dividing the revenue fairly on civil and ecclesiastical affairs, and providing for workmen and for the poor.

Many things have been ascribed to him which did not belong to him or only in part. The important institution of trial by jury has been credited to him, but the germ of this existed before him in the customs of the Teutonic tribes; but he probably reduced the customs to the definite form of laws. The division of the country into parishes, hundreds, and shires has been described as his work; but in all probability this important work was not the product of one man's labour but of generations of men.

King Alfred was a man of war as well as of peace. He came to the throne in times of national trouble. The Danes had for some time harassed the country, and had become numerous, daring, and formidable, and threatened the safety of the English state. The great difficulty of Alfred's reign was the power of these invaders. We shall describe his wars more fully when we come to consider the Danes and their position in England. It is said that he fought

fifty-six battles against the Danes on sea or land. In the early part of his reign he suffered defeat and was compelled to retire to a hiding place in the Isle of Athelney, in Somersetshire, where he constructed a fort and prepared for the opportunity when he struck the blow and drove the Danes away. The unity and power of England established by Egbert had been much interfered with by the incursions of the Danes and it was the work of Alfred to restore this unity and to save the country from the barbarians, which he suceeeded in doing. In the accomplishment of his great task he formed a navy consisting of long ships after a model invented by himself. This navy was of great service against an enemy who came from the sea. It is generally admitted that Alfred was the first to create a navy for the defence of England. He succeeded ultimately in conquering the Danes, but not in driving them from the country. He made London his capital, which he fortified. He ruled as a constitutional monarch, calling his great council together twice a year in London, Oxford, or Gloucester. After a reign of nearly thirty years, he died on the 26th of October in the year 901. "He was king over the whole English nation, save that part which was under the Danes."

Alfred was succeeded by his eldest son, Edward, who is known in history as the Elder, because there was another Edward who reigned about seventy years afterwards. He was elected by the great council, but his right was disputed by his cousin Ethelwold, and a war ensued, the pretender seizing the royal town of Wimborne. He was, however, obliged to flee under the attack of Edward. He retired to Northumbria, where the Danes made him king, hoping by such an alliance to defeat the English king. More Danes arrived from beyond the seas. The Danes of East Anglia also united with them in an attack on Mercia, and then marched into Wiltshire and ravaged the country. Edward in revenge invaded and ravaged East Anglia and defeated the confederates whose kings were slain, and Edward having no rival in 906 he made peace with the two Danish kingdoms. The Danes again renewed the war in the year 910, but were defeated by Edward. In 912 Ethelred, the sub-king of Mercia, died, and Edward incorporated London and Oxford into his kingdom. A Welsh king of the name of Owen invaded Mercia, but he was defeated and followed up, and the town of Brecon was captured. Owen escaped and retired to Derby, then in the occupation of the Danes. The town was stormed by the English and Owen killed himself. The English power advanced. The Danish fortresses of Northampton, Colchester, and York surrendered. Mercia was absorbed in the English kingdom. The kings of the Scots, of Northumbria, and the Welsh king and people of Strathclyde acknowledged Edward as supreme king. In the following year, 925, Edward died at Farrington and was buried at Winchester. He was an able ruler and warrior, equal to his father Alfred except in learning.

He was succeeded by his son Athelstan. He had five brothers

and nine sisters. He had been a favourite of his grandfather, Alfred the Great. He was crowned by the archbishop of Canterbury at Kingston in the year 925, when he was about thirty years of age. His Life was written, not by a contemporary, but by the distinguished monk of the abbey of Malmesbury called in history William of Malmesbury. Athelstan was a benefactor to this abbey, and there the monk found some memorials and traditions of the king. He had few difficulties in establishing himself on his throne. In the year after his accession the Danish king of Northumbria, to whom he had given one of his sisters in marriage, died or was killed by his own subjects, and Athelstan seized the kingdom and annexed it to England without any difficulty. He became a very powerful monarch. The Danish jarls, the nobles of Northumbria, East Anglia, and Mercia, and some Welsh princes assembled at his Witenagemote and acknowledged his supremacy. We have noticed in an earlier part of this history how he drove the Welsh from Exeter across the Tamar into Cornwall. He had to contend against the Britons of the north on several occasions. During a few years in the early part of his reign he had comparative peace, but it was only the calm before the storm. The Danes, who at this period were the disturbers of England, prepared to dispute his power and authority. A federation was formed against him consisting of Danes under Anlaf, who had come from over the sea in a fleet of over six hundred ships ; Constantine, the king of Scotland ; Owen, a British prince of Cumbria, and other Welsh princes, and even some English. Athelstan gathered his troops and marched to the north against the confederates, and the battle of Brunanburg in 937—the greatest of his times—came off. This place is considered to be in Northumberland. The Chronicle states that it was the fiercest battle fought since the English people came to the island of Britain. The losses were great on both sides, but the confederation was defeated and broken up. The king lived three years after this battle, and died October 20th in the year 940, aged 46, and he was buried at Malmesbury, where his tomb may be seen in the abbey church, the remains of the old abbey.

Athelstan was never married and left no heir to his throne. His half-brother, Edmund I., succeeded him on the throne, though only eighteen years of age. The times were difficult, and the Danes, though defeated at Brunanburg, were numerous and powerful. They again entered the field under Anlaf, invaded Edmund's dominions, gained some victories, and were again defeated. The final result was that Anlaf and Edmund came to an agreement by which Edmund ceded to the Danish chief the country north of Watling Street and Anlaf acknowledged Edmund as the over-king. Edmund was a man of ability, but his life was short ; he died in the year 946 after a reign of six years. He was killed really by a robber on the 26th of May at a place called Pucklechurch in Gloucestershire.

His children were young, and his brother Edred succeeded him on the throne. He was an able ruler and warrior. The kingdom of Northumbria revolted in 947, but Edred advanced against the Danes of that province and defeated them. In the year 954 Northumbria finally submitted to English supremacy and was changed into an earldom under the rule of Oswulf. In the year 955, he assumed the title of king of the Anglo-Saxons and emperor of all Britain. In the same year, however, he died. The place of his death was Frome, in Somersetshire, on the 23rd of November, 955.

The nephew of Edred, Edwy, succeeded him when he was only fifteen years of age. In this age a most conspicuous person was Dunstan, an ecclesiastic of high pretentions and authority. He was at Glastonbury and trained in its noted monastery. He was a favourite of the king Athelstan. He was under the suspicion of being the cultivator of the magical arts. After a struggle between his affection for a lady and ambition, he resolved to become a monk of the Benedictine Order at Glastonbury. He became abbot in the year 943 and a councillor of King Edmund. He was the friend and minister of King Edred. Edwy, however, did not like him. He wished to marry a lady of the name of Elgiva who was related to him in blood or law. Dunstan and other churchmen were opposed to the marriage on the ground that the relation was within the prohibited degrees. In those days of superstition and priestly power the prohibited degrees extended to the sixth cousin. Persons were prohibited marrying if they had a common ancestor within eight generations. Relations of affinity as well as consanguinity, and even spiritual relations, were included. Men often had more wives than one or concubines and were tolerated, but if they married a distant cousin of any sort, they were condemned by "the Church" or by the priests. The coronation by Odo, the archbishop of Canterbury, took place in the year 956 and the marriage with Elgiva in 957. This led to a quarrel between the king and Dunstan. The party of the king triumphed, and Dunstan had to leave the country. Some of Dunstan's faction left the court and made Edgar, the youngest brother of the king, king of Mercia and Northumbria. Edgar recalled Dunstan, and Odo the archbishop pronounced the marriage void and joined the faction of Edgar. In the following year, 958, on 1st of October, Edwy died or was murdered. Some of the tales concerning the king and his wife are unfounded, the product of priestly invention. In those ancient times the greatest curse was the power of the priests intruding into the domain of the civil power and dictating to kings and peoples—Dunstan, of course, rising to the greatest power. He was successively bishop of Worcester, London, and Canterbury. The story relating to the devil and the hot iron when Dunstan was a monk in the monastery is a fabrication of after times.

Edgar succeeded his brother as king in Wessex, as well as in

Mercia and Northumbria, in the year 958. His reign was mostly peaceful and he was designated "Edgar the Peaceable." Even the Danes did not disturb him during sixteen years of his reign. Under the influence of Dunstan he pursued a policy in favour of the Church, he promoted the establishment and endowment of monasteries, the celibacy of the clergy by the expulsion of the married priests.

Some of the tales relating to him, such as that of the beautiful lady Elfrida, are considered mere invention of a later time. He was a man of violent temper and of lawless disposition, and he offended many of his subjects by associating with pagan companions, especially the Danes. He protected his kingdom against invasion and insubordination by the great enlargement of the fleet, said to consist of 3,600 ships, but this was a great exaggeration ; but his fleet, which was reviewed every year, was unquestionably strong.

He was sometimes at war with the Britons or Welsh. The king of North Wales, Idwal, refused to pay the tribute imposed by Athelstan. The result was a war in which the Welsh were defeated and Idwal slain and their submission. He also conducted an expedition against the Britons of Cumbria. The Britons of West Wales accepted his supremacy. The subordinate kings, or princes of Scotland, Cumbria, Strathclyde, and Wales met him at Chester, conducted him in a barge to the monastery of St. John the Baptist, and returned in the same manner, doing homage to him as the over-king of the entire country. His life was a short one, for he died, aged only thirty-two, in the year 975.

Edgar left two sons by two different wives, whose names were Edward, commonly called the Martyr, and Ethelred. The former was thirteen and the latter seven years of age. The mother of Ethelred intrigued to have her son made king, but Dunstan prevented this, and with the aid of the archbishop of York consecrated Edward as king. His reign was short, for in the following year he was murdered at Corfe Castle, in Dorsetshire, by the instigation of his stepmother Elfrida. He was interred without any royal ceremony at Wareham. Ethelred succeeded, and was crowned in the year 979 when only eleven years of age. The chief feature of his reign was the renewal of the Danish incursions, encouraged probably by the decline, if not disappearance, of the magnificent English fleet. They appeared on various parts of the coast—Kent, Hants and North Wales. There was much internal trouble—disturbances in many places, London burnt down, and a great murrain among the cattle prevailed. Dunstan died in the year 988. The greater part of Ethelred's reign, nearly thirty years, was spent in defending the country against the Danes, led by Sweyn, son of Harold Blue-tooth. The Danes became very formidable. They were bought off by a payment of money. Then the king tried to free his country by a crime—the massacre of the Danes. This was avenged by the king of Denmark. Ethel-

red flies from the country; Sweyn becomes king, dies and Ethelred returns in 1014. He dies in 1016. Canute the Dane becomes sole king of England in 1017. The Saxon dynasty was restored under Edward the Confessor. Harold II. became king and was defeated and slain by the Normans in the year 1066, 14th of October. Henceforward the Normans became the rulers of England.

CHAPTER XX

THE CONVERSION OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS

In a previous chapter we have shown that the ancient Britons were converted to Christianity in the second century, if not earlier. We must not understand by these words that all the inhabitants of the country underwent simultaneously that spiritual change denoted by the term conversion when applied to an individual who voluntarily accepts into his soul the vital truths of the Gospel. Nations are not thus converted at any period of time. The acceptance of the new religion by a few, perhaps by chiefs and leaders, usually denotes the commencement of the movement, which spreads farther and farther until the nation, nominally at least, may be considered converted. How far the process of conversion had gone on among the Britons of the second century we cannot precisely say. We know that it must have gradually advanced, and that churches were duly organised, for we find that in the beginning of the fourth century the organisation was so complete that three bishops of the British churches were present at the Council of Arles in Gaul in the year 314.

The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons must not be confounded with that of the Britons, which took place four centuries apart. The Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles, when successively they invaded Britain, were pagans and idolaters. The history of their conversion is not like that of the Britons, hid in darkness. We have already given part of the account and the interview of the agents with the British Christians. We must here give a summary of the history. The conversion of the Anglo-Saxons was effected primarily by missionaries sent from the Roman bishop, Pope Gregory the Great. The conversion of the Britons was caused most probably by their intercourse with the people of the south-east of Gaul—Lyons, and perhaps Marseilles—where Christian churches had been established possessing the features of the Eastern, or Greek Churches. The story of Gregory's first observation of the Angles as slaves in Rome has been already given, which is probably to a large extent mythical; but the mission from Rome to England was a reality and historical. The idolatry of the Anglo-Saxons has left its remains in the names of the days of the week. The Sunday and the Monday were dedicated to the sun and moon, and were not peculiar to the Teutonic people.

Their god Woden, after which our Wednesday is called, was a cruel god, to whom human sacrifices were offered to appease his anger. Historians have maintained that the Britons under Druidical instruction offered human sacrifices in ancient times, but we have shown reason to doubt this representation. The institution of human sacrifices, however, did exist among barbarous peoples in ancient times as it does even now in some parts of Africa and the South Sea Islands. The god Freya, to whom our Friday was dedicated, was the Teutonic god of love or, perhaps more correctly, of lust, and corresponded to the Roman god Venus. The god Thor, to which Thursday was dedicated, was represented under the figure of a hammer by which he crushed his enemies, and seemed to correspond to the Roman and Greek Hercules, the god of power, or the invisible force which expressed itself in thunder. Originally the gods of the ancient mythology were probably intended to be personifications of the powers of nature ; and as men sank lower in intelligence and in their appreciation of the spiritual, they came to recognise the images as gods to whom worship should be offered. Hence originated the systems of idolatry in the world. The common mind under the government of the senses soon comes to identify the sign and the thing signified, and ascribes to the sign, the visible idol, what originally was intended for the spiritual being it represented. This process of confounding the sign and the thing signified has not been unknown among Christian Churches, giving rise to the worship in some sense of the image or the picture of the invisible. The idolatry of the Anglo-Saxons was a part of the systems of the Teutonic people generally, and, to a large extent, of the ancient world. To save the Angles from this system of cruel idolatry, Augustine and his companions were sent from Rome by Gregory the Great.

When Gregory was a monk he conceived the idea of placing himself at the head of a mission for the conversion of the English. He obtained the consent of Pope Benedict, and actually started on his journey. When the Roman people became aware of his departure, they persuaded the pope to withdraw his consent and recall the missionary Gregory, whose presence in Rome in critical times was deemed necessary. The missionary was overtaken at the distance of three days' journey and ordered to return. The work was thus abandoned for the time. But when Gregory was made the pope, the scheme was revived, and the mission was entrusted to the monk Augustine and his companions, said to be altogether forty in number. Augustine was the prior of the St. Andrew's Foundation, where these monks were trained for their work, and he was appointed their leader.

The missionaries proceeded to Britain through Gaul. At one point of their journey they were somewhat frightened by the accounts of the barbarous character of the English people that reached them, but Gregory would not allow them to abandon their mission. He made Augustine abbot, sent letters to the

bishop of Aix, the abbot of Serino, and the governor of the province to assist the missionaries in their journey. He also wrote to the Church authorities at Vienne, Autun, Tours, Marseilles, and Arles, and to some of the secular rulers of the districts through which they would have to pass, asking them to render assistance.

The missionaries safely passed through Gaul and arrived in Britain, landing at the same place that the Jutes landed a century and a half previously, namely, at Ebbsfleet, in the Isle of Thanet, the kingdom of Kent. There is now a farm on that spot called Ebbsfleet. It was in the year 580 that Gregory had his first impulse to go to Britain as a missionary to the Anglo-Saxons. He became the pope of Rome in 590, but was too much occupied with other public affairs to turn his attention to the Anglo-Saxons. In the year 595, however, he came to the determination to commence operations. He selected from his own monastery a monk as the leader of a band of missionaries whose name was Augustine, a man of many qualifications but perhaps wanting in patience and tact. They commenced their long journey soon after their appointment. They did not, however, arrive in England till the early part of the year 597. Travelling in those days was very slow, very different from what it is now. They were undoubtedly delayed in passing through Gaul by the necessity of interviewing the various ecclesiastical and civil rulers of the country. They had also to engage interpreters to render into English the Latin which Augustine spoke. After the inevitable delay the missionaries, as explained, landed in the kingdom of Kent. The king of this state was then Ethelbert. Augustine sent messengers to the king asking for an interview, which was granted. The queen was fortunately a Christian. Her name was Bertha. She was the daughter of Charibert, the king of the Franks of Paris. The marriage contract provided that she was to have the free exercise of her religion. She brought over with her a chaplain whose name was Luidhard, who had been bishop of Senlis. Bishops in those days had not such large spheres of labour as now. The old British church of St. Martin at Canterbury had been assigned for the Christian worship of the queen conducted by Luidhard. This was very favourable to the success of the missionaries.

The king went to the Isle of Thanet to seek the promised interview with Augustine. He stipulated that the interview should be in the open air to avoid any magical arts. On the approach of the king the missionaries advanced to meet him in a procession. In the front was a man carrying a silver cross ; then came Augustine ; then, painted on a board, a picture of Jesus Christ ; then followed the other missionaries, led by Honorius, chanting in Gregorian notes litanies for the salvation of themselves and the Anglo-Saxons. The interview took place under an oak. Augustine addressed the king, explaining the object of his mission. His words were interpreted by the men brought from Gaul. The

king answered that their words and promises seemed fair ; he could not himself leave the faith of his fathers, but his people could please themselves. He invited them to come and reside in Canterbury, the capital of his kingdom. There they came and resided, and the Church of St. Martin was assigned them as the place of Christian worship. The success of Augustine was speedy. The king was converted, and on the 2nd of June, 597, being that year the Whitsuntide festival, he was baptized. The progress of conversion among the people of the kingdom was rapid. By the time of Christmas of the same year ten thousand persons were baptized at the mouth of the Medway opposite the Isle of Sheppey. According to instructions from Pope Gregory, Augustine crossed over to Gaul, and was made bishop of the English, and on his return to England he received from Gregory the Pall. He soon began to build what became the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury. More missionaries were sent from Rome, and Augustine was appointed the archbishop or the metropolitan of the twelve bishoprics intended to be established in the southern part of England. The whole of Kent was soon said to be converted to Christianity. The kingdom of the East Saxons was also soon brought over to Christianity. The king Sebert was converted ; he was a nephew of Ethelbert. The capital of this kingdom was London, and this important city was made the seat of a bishop in the year 601, and Mellitus, one of the additional missionaries sent by Gregory, became the first bishop. About the same time the city of Rochester, in Kent, was made the seat of another bishop. Thus, so far as mere machinery was concerned, the Church was making wonderful progress.

We must not, however, suppose that the conversion of entire peoples led on by their kings or chiefs implied that the process of intellectual apprehension, mental conviction, and spiritual change of heart did take place in the individual minds of the persons who composed them. Such was not the case. The people followed their leaders without much knowledge of what they were doing. There could not have been much instruction imparted. The missionaries did not understand the language of the people, and at first could only teach through interpreters. This must have been a slow process, and Christian teaching must have been limited and imperfect. The result was seen in the course of a few years. The conversions which did not rest on personal thought and experience were superficial and could not endure. In the year 617 King Ethelbert died, and he was succeeded by his son Eadbald, who was a pagan. Under his government the people of Kent relapsed into heathenism and the work of Augustine seemed to have passed away because it was not founded on personal conviction. Augustine himself died in the year 604, or, according to some reports, in 605, or even in 607. Gregory the Great also died in the year 605. The successor of Augustine, appointed by himself, was Laurentius, who immediately succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury on

the death of his master. The condition of matters was so bad that the archbishop, Mellitus the bishop of London, and Justus the bishop of Rochester, agreed to leave the country. The two bishops actually departed, but Laurentius remained and slept alone in his cathedral church. The account of his experience in this lonely church, given by Bede, is full of superstition. However, Laurentius became the means of the conversion of the king Eadbald, and the people returned to their faith in Christianity. The two bishops, Mellitus and Justus, returned to their bishoprics ; but Mellitus was not received back to London, the people being more obedient to their pagan priests. The inhabitants of Essex, or East Anglia, remained much longer before they returned to the even nominal faith of Christianity. It was not till the Greek Theodore of Tarsus was sent to England in the year 668 to be archbishop of Canterbury, and to organise the Church in Britain, that Essex returned to the faith of Christ.

The interest in Christian extension was transferred from the south to the north of England. The work began first with the king of Northumbria as in Kent. Perhaps under the circumstances this was inevitable. Access to the people was possible only through the king. The king of Northumbria was Eadwine or Edwin. As a boy he had been driven from his native country and found shelter with the king of North Wales, but after the battle of Chester, when the king of North Wales, or Gwynedd, was terribly defeated by Ethelfrith, the king of Northumbria, Edwin had to seek shelter elsewhere, and found it in East Anglia, where Redwald was king. After passing through some dangers here owing to the repeated requests that he should be given up to Ethelfrith, he attained to freedom and prosperity. Redwald marched an army against the king of Northumbria, and defeated him in a battle on the bank of the river Idle. The result of this battle was to restore Edwin to his native country and the throne of which he had been deprived. He married Ethelburga, daughter of Ethelbert and Bertha of Kent, and he promised not to interfere with his wife's religion as a Christian, and he gave a conditional promise that he himself would adopt the faith of his wife. At first he did not fulfil his promise, but ultimately yielded to the influence of his wife and her instructor, Bishop Paulinus, who had accompanied her from Kent. Edwin, however, wished to consult the Witan, or the assembly of wise men, who were usually consulted in Anglo-Saxon states. The Witan was gathered together, and Edwin referred the question to them. According to the account of Bede, the old pagan high priest whose name was Coifi soon decided the matter in favour of Christianity. He is represented as reasoning and speaking after the manner of a philosophic theologian and declaring that the gods did nothing for them. The bishop Paulinus delivered a suitable discourse on the nature and importance of Christianity. The nobles and many of the people received the Christian faith. The high

priest, Coifi, as an evidence of his conviction and of the impotence of the gods, began at once to profane the heathen temple. The king was baptized at York in the year 627, on Easter Day, in a temporary church built of wood on the site now occupied by the great minster.

It is probable—almost certain—that Edwin's residence at the Christian court of Cadvan, king of Gwynedd, when a fugitive, prepared him to become a Christian. It is also probable from Nennius's History and the Cambrian Annals that the British Church of the north had some part in the work. The king and Paulinus laboured for six years to bring over the people of Northumbria to the Christian faith. The work, however, was interrupted by war. Edwin had to defend himself in a war against the combined forces of Mercia under the king Penda and the Britons under Cadwallon. Edwin fell in the battle of Heathfield in the year 633. The result of the war was a reaction in favour of paganism, and the widow of Edwin, Ethelburga, and the bishop Paulinus returned from Northumbria to Kent. Paulinus was made the bishop of Rochester. The mission work of Augustine thus seemed to have been undone everywhere except in Kent, and even there it was in a feeble condition. It is evident that too much has been ascribed to Augustine and his companions in the conversion of England.

The kingdom of Northumbria, after the death of Edwin in 633, was again divided into two states as formerly, namely, Bernicia and Deira, and two kings were appointed. Eanfrid became the king of Bernicia. He was the eldest son of Ethelfrith. The king of Deira was Osric, who was a cousin of Edwin. These two kings had been previously baptized, and professed to be Christians, but they both fell in with the pagan reaction. These facts, of course, show that the conversions of kings and people were nominal and ceremonial, and not real. This reaction, however, did not last long. The two kings soon disappeared. Osric, in the year 634, was killed in an attempt to besiege the British king Cadwallon, and Eanfrid was murdered soon afterwards when having an interview with Cadwallon with the intention of suing for peace. The two divided kingdoms were again united, and Oswald was chosen king over the united Northumbria. This king had been baptized and taught Christianity by the British Christians of the north or of Iona. After he was settled on the throne, Oswald sent to Iona to request that a bishop should be sent to aid him in restoring Northumbria from paganism to Christianity. A man was sent of the name of Corman. He was, however, unfit for the task. He was austere and overbearing, and showed that he was a mere domineering priest. Failing entirely, Corman returned. The successor was a man of a different temper, whose name was Aidan—St. Aidan. He was wise, temperate, and persuasive. He presented himself to the king, who was a zealous Christian. He was supplied by Oswald with a centre of operations in the island of Lindisfarne,

situated on the coast of Northumbria, near the mouth of the Tweed. This place was afterwards called Holy Island. Aidan was assisted in his work by a band of missionaries of the Columban Order. It was by these men, and not by the Roman missionaries, that Northumbria was permanently converted.

The conversion of the important Anglian state of Mercia followed that of Northumbria, and by the same agencies. The noted king Penda, who raised Mercia to a position of power, was a pagan, and was a furious opponent of Christianity; but Christianity made quiet progress in his kingdom during his reign. His own son, Paeda, became a Christian, and was baptized on his visit to Northumbria, where his sister was then wife of the king Oswin. The king Oswald reigned in Northumbria only nine years. Penda had invaded East Anglia and conquered it and took away the supremacy of Northumbria. Oswald then marched against Penda, and a great battle ensued, when Oswald was slain. The place has been variously identified; the most common has been Maserfield, at Oswestry, in Shropshire, the place deriving its name from Oswald. Penda marched against Northumbria, but was defeated, and he perished in the year 655. Strange to say, the Christian princes of North Wales united with the pagan king Penda against Northumbria. Penda's son Paeda had become a Christian, as before stated, through the influence of his sister and brother-in-law Oswin, brother of Oswald, king of Northumbria. Returning home, Paeda brought with him four priests, namely, Cedda, Adda, Bith, and Diuma, whose labours among the common people of Mercia were very successful. Henceforth Mercia was a Christian kingdom. Mercia for some time became subject to Northumbria, and was governed by deputies appointed from Northumbria. Then the Mercian nobles took from his concealment Wulfere, the youngest son of Penda, and placed him on the throne.

The result of Northumbria's supremacy over Mercia was the extension of Christianity by the agency of the missionaries from Iona. St. Finan, also from Iona, succeeded St. Aidan in the chief position in the evangelisation of Northumbria and Mercia. This great apostle from the north appointed as the first bishop in Mercia, Diuma. The king of Essex, Sigebert, was also converted mainly through the influence of Oswin, the Northumbrian king, and a bishop was appointed in his dominion, whose name was Cedda, and his seat was fixed in London.

The introduction of Christianity into Wessex, which ultimately became the dominant state in England and absorbed the rest, has not come under our observation. The work was arrested in the south, but it was revived and strengthened by Felix in East Anglia. In Wessex Berinus, a Benedictine monk from Rome, was the main agent in the spread of Christianity. He went there in the year 634, sent through the advice or authority of Pope Honorius, who was pope from 625 to 638. This Berinus was assisted by Oswald, of Northumbria, and by

missionaries from the north. The king of Wessex, whose name was Cynegils, was converted, and by his consent a bishop's see was created in Oxfordshire at a place called Dorchester, not to be confounded with the town of the same name in Dorsetshire.

The last Saxon kingdom converted to Christianity was Sussex, or the kingdom of the South Saxons. A Northumbrian bishop of the name of Wilfrid, who had been expelled from his own country, came to Sussex and settled there, and devoted himself to the conversion of the South Saxons. They were mostly pagans worshipping the gods they brought with them from Germany. The king and queen had been baptized and were recognised as Christians, but the mass of the population were pagans. Some small efforts had been made to Christianise the people, but not with much success. The advent of Wilfrid was the beginning of a movement which resulted in the conversion of the South Saxons and bringing their state into line with the other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. The coming of Wilfrid was in the year 681, and was at a time when the people were suffering from a famine brought on by drought. He took advantage of this state of things and taught the people the use of nets in catching fish, by which food may be procured. The success of Wilfrid in the conversion of the people was soon apparent, and large numbers were baptized. It is said that the day on which the ceremony of baptism took place, the drought came to an end. This coincidence, if it existed, contributed to the work of conversion as then understood by the Church. The extension of the Christian work went on rapidly, and the South Saxon state soon became like the rest of England, nominally Christian.

The various states that constituted the Anglo-Saxon commuuity may now be said to have become Christian, though only nominally so. It would be unreasonable to contend that the peoples were Christianised according to the modern standard in thought, experience, and practice. They were very ignorant and had very imperfect conceptions of the nature of the Christian life. The natives of Africa and the islands of the South Seas in our time, when they become Christian, do not exhibit any fine models of Christian thought and life. It requires time for any barbarous and pagan people to attain to a high standard of moral and Christian life. This must be considered in relation to the Anglo-Saxons more than a thousand years ago. The Roman missionaries came to Britain at the close of the sixth century, and now at the end of the seventh century, after many fluctuations, the Anglo-Saxon states had become nominally Christian.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the result was due entirely or mainly to the agency of the Roman Church. There was a Church among the Celtic people of Britain, Wales, and Ireland and the north before the coming of the Saxons. The missionaries who proceeded from Ireland, and the Britons from the west and north, were the chief agents in the conversion of the people of the north—Northumbria and Scotland. It is not

our purpose to describe the conversion of Ireland, but only to refer to it in connection with our present topic. The man who first introduced Christianity into Ireland was Palladius, a monk probably from Brittany in Gaul. His mission, however, was not successful and he retired. The most effectual work was done by St. Patrick, who was probably a Briton or Welshman. He is considered by the Irish the real agent in the conversion of the country, and afterwards was made the patron saint of Ireland. The Irish proverb illustrates this: "Not to Palladius, but to Patrick God granted the conversion of Ireland," or in its Latin form, "Non Palladio sed Patricio Dominus convertendam Hiberniam concessit." St. Patrick was assisted in his missionary work by other monks, including some British. After the time of St. Patrick there was a relapse in the religion of Ireland. To overcome this, another Irish mission was organised in Wales by St. David, Cadoc, and Gildas, and this was the cause of reviving Christianity in Ireland. In those times—the sixth century—there was frequent intercourse between the Celtic Christians of Wales, of Ireland, and of Brittany. The revival of Christianity in Ireland by this mission was followed by a great movement which resulted in the establishment of Christianity in Scotland, amongst the Picts of Galloway and the people of the north of England. The men engaged in this work were St. Columba, St. Ninian, and St. Kentigern, and others. St. Columba came from Ireland or from the Scoti, as the Irish of the north of Ireland were then called; and St. Kentigern was once the bishop of St. Asaph, which he was induced to leave and become the bishop of Glasgow. This took place under the direction of Rhydderch, the great monarch of Cumbria, in the sixth century. It was mainly by the activity of these men, and especially by the monks of the Columban Order, whose headquarters were Iona, that the evangelisation of the north took place. The restoration of Christianity, even in Northumbria, was mainly due to this agency.

The Roman Church, represented by the archbishop of Canterbury, was somewhat jealous of the western Church represented by the Columban monks. The western or Celtic Churches did not agree with the Roman Church as to the time of celebrating Easter, and the form of the tonsure. In the seventh century the Roman and the Columban Churches came into collision in Northumbria during the reign of Oswin, or Oswy. The Synod of Whitby was held in the year A.D. 664 to discuss these differences. The archbishop of Canterbury then was Deusdedit. The synod was attended by representatives of both Churches. The leaders in the discussion were on the Celtic side Bishop Colman, and on the Roman side Wilfrid, afterwards archbishop. The controversy was nominally on the small questions mentioned, but really on the supremacy of the one Church or the other. The Celtic Christians had not acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman Church, and for many ages did not do so. The result of the conference was in favour of the Roman views of Easter and

the tonsure. Such is the account given by Baeda. The Celtic bishops were not convinced, but returned to their monasteries. At this time the Celtic Church of the west was mainly monastic in its organisation, and the Roman Church of Canterbury was more secular and more organised under the Roman system of episcopacy. Among the Celtic Christians in Wales, Ireland, and the north, the monastery was a Christian settlement which formed a centre of operation for the district around, and the superintendent of the establishment was usually a bishop, not a diocesan bishop in the modern sense of the word. Hence we find that in those days bishops were more numerous than they are now or were under the Roman system. "The episcopacy during these centuries was invariably conventual in character. Each see had its central monastic establishment with a bishop attached to it" ("The Ancient British Church," p. 176, J. Pryce).

The representation of the controversy by the Venerable Bede was written under the Anglo-Saxon bias. The Britons of the north were overborne by the dictation of the Roman representatives and the authority of the Northumbrian king, Oswy, but they returned to their own homes unconvinced of the importance of the changes proposed, and continued for a time longer to observe their own seasons and ceremonies. The change was effected in the English part of the north under the jurisdiction of the king of Northumbria, but in the districts governed from Iona and the province of the Dalriadian Scots the old practices continued. To modern conceptions these controversies seem very trivial. The time when Easter should be celebrated was disputed by the Greek and the Roman Churches, and the differences have continued to the present time. The Roman Church contended for the time which regulated the Passover among the Jews, but the Greek Church adhered to the precise date of the original celebration. The question of the tonsure was very frivolous. The tonsure, or shaving a part of the head, was intended as a sign of devotion to the service of God. According to the Roman custom the crown of the head was shaved, "leaving a circle of hair to represent the crown of thorns." The custom of the British and Irish Church was to shave from ear to ear —"*ab aure ad aurum*"—across the front of the head. Such were the trifles of serious discussion among the ancient Churches respecting ceremonies originating, not by the apostles, but by the priests of after times. Gradually the Christians of the north gave way reluctantly to the Roman usages. In the Pictish kingdom of Galloway the Roman customs were accepted about the year 710, and among the Christians of the Columban Order a few years later. The Britons of West Wales conformed to the Roman customs at the beginning of the eighth century; and about the year 760 (755–768) the bishop of Bangor, Elfod, induced the Britons of North Wales to do the same. The Welsh of South Wales, however, refused to conform; but they gave way in the year A.D. 777 reluctantly. This change, however, was not

taken to imply submission to the English Church on the part of the Welsh Church.

Much of the information of an ecclesiastical nature relating to these times has come from the writings of the Venerable Bede, modified by the writings of ancient British authors. Bede was the historian of the Anglo-Saxons. He was born at Jarrow in the ancient kingdom of Northumbria in the year 673. He was placed when young in the monastery of Wearmouth by Bishop Benedict, and afterwards in that of Jarrow. He spent his life in these monasteries. Benedict established a fine library of books brought from Rome and Vienne, and formed relations with foreign and home seats of learning. Bede had access to this library, and there he gained his Roman, Gallican, Irish, and Canterbury learning. The greater part of his life was spent in the reading and studying of these works, from which he gathered his materials for the composition of his works. The only journey he apparently ever made was a visit to Egbert, archbishop of York, and this was in connection with the advancement of learning. This was in the year 734, when he was sixty-one years of age. He wrote many books, commentaries on books of Scripture, hymns and epigrams, and biographies of some abbots of Jarrow and Wearmouth, and some that were intended to be scientific. The chief and the most important of his works was his "Ecclesiastical History." It was addressed to Ceolwulf, king of Northumbria, and records English history to the year 731. The book is most important and was honestly written, but it was one-sided, ascribing more to the work of Augustine and the Canterbury authorities than to the British missionaries.

There were in the seventh century two other men among the English who should be here mentioned—the one is Caedman the poet, and the other is Cuthbert the monk. The former was originally a man of rustic condition and uneducated. He rose, however, in middle age to be a genuine poet. The account of the development of his poetic genius is given in the custom of an age of superstition. The poem ascribed to him has been criticised, but it seems characteristic of his age. One part of his poem gives a description of the place of torment. The poet flourished about the year 680. He lived and died in the north. Cuthbert was a contemporary of Cadmon and Bede. He was born in the year 625, and was a native of Northumbria. He became a monk at the monastery of Melrose. In 660 he went with the Abbot Eata to occupy a new foundation at Ripon. Cuthbert did not hold the Roman view as to the time of celebrating Easter and he soon left. He became the abbot of Melrose, and in the year 664 he became the prior of the abbey of Lindisfarne. He then became bishop. In 686 he died. His influence and power were very great.

CHAPTER XXI

THE DANES AND THE NORWEGIANS

The inhabitants of England, as distinguished from the other parts of the United Kingdom, have usually been called Anglo-Saxons. They have been represented as descended from the Jutes, the Saxons, and the Angles. That this is to some extent the case cannot be denied. The statement, however, admits of modification. In the course of this work it has been shown that the British or the Celtic element is a larger and more potent factor in the composition of the people of this country than many persons imagine or some historians admit. The Britons were not destroyed or entirely driven out of the interior of England during the conflicts of the fifth and sixth centuries. Many of them remained, submitted to the conquerors, and became serfs or slaves. In the west—Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, and even in Wilts—the Britons remained for centuries the great mass of the people. In the north the long strip of country from the Clyde to the Dee formed the British states of Strathclyde and Cumbria, inhabited by Britons, and remained for ages a distinct people. These states embraced Cumberland, Westmorland, Lancashire, and the westerly portion of Yorkshire. The people of this large region were mainly Celtic. These statements clearly indicate that the present mixed population of England have descended to a considerable extent from the ancient Britons as well as from the Anglo-Saxons.

There is another element in the population which we now have to consider, and which has entered considerably into the complex population of England—the Danes, and to a less extent the Norwegians. The history of the Danish invasions and their successive conflicts with the Anglo-Saxons has not been recorded in the clearest and most orderly manner. Long before they made any settlement in the country they pursued the trade of pirates and rovers, living upon robbery and pillage. They harassed the coasts of England and other countries, and became the terror of the inhabitants. According to the Saxon Chronicle, their first appearance on the British coast was in the year 787, when they arrived in three ships. The local magistrate who went to meet the invaders and to inquire whence they came and what they wanted was, along with his attendant, slain. This was an illustration of

the ferocity and barbarism of the invaders. They then pillaged and destroyed the place and re-embarked with their booty. They appeared again on the coast in the year 794, but not in large numbers.

It was in the reign of Egbert of Wessex that the Danes invaded the country in formidable numbers, when the king had reduced England into one united state which came to be known as England. In the year 831 they landed on the island of Sheppey, and in the following year, 832, they arrived at Charmouth, in Dorsetshire, in thirty-five ships of war. Egbert was unprepared to meet them, and his troops gave way. Another armament entered the Dart in Devonshire, and subsequently, in the year 835, landed in Cornwall, and were joined by the Britons or Welsh, who groaned under the bondage of the Saxons. They were, however, defeated by Egbert, and many of them were slain. The Cornish Britons were subdued and severely punished by the king. Soon after this Egbert died, in the year 837 or 838. The battle at which Egbert defeated the united Danes and Welsh was at Hengesteston. The southern and western coasts continued to be harassed by the Danes, and the Welsh of North Wales became troublesome and were driven back by King Ethelwulf, who had succeeded his father Egbert. This was in the year 837. The Danes landed in thirty-four ships at Southampton, but were defeated by the men of that district. They appeared off Portland and defeated the men of Dorsetshire after a desperate struggle. Great battles were fought at different places, including Canterbury, Rochester, and London, causing great slaughter. The successive battles in the west led to nothing decisive and to no great settlement of Danes in south and west. The most important event in the Danish invasions were to occur elsewhere.

In the year 864 the great Danish pirate Ragnor Lodbrog, after a roving life of robbery and pillage for thirty years, landed with an army on the coast of Northumbria and marched into the interior of the country, spreading ruin and death before him. They came now not as formerly, as mere pirates and plunderers, but as settlers and conquerors. Ella, the king of Northumbria, marched against the Danes and defeated them. According to tradition, Ella put Lodbrog to a fearful death, to avenge which his sons and countrymen resolved to invade and subdue the country. In the year 866 the Danes landed in East Anglia and marched across the Humber to York. The East Anglians offered no resistance. Here they remained until they had accumulated sufficient supplies, and then they advanced towards their destined ground, Northumbria, of which York was the capital. This kingdom was then, as many times before, divided into two, and was ruled by two hostile and contending kings, Osbert and Ella. These united for the purpose of opposing the Danes. The advantage was at first with the Angles, but the Danes finally triumphed. Osbert was killed and Ella was taken prisoner and shared a fate similar to that Lodbrog received from him. The city of York was captured by the Danes

and made the headquarters for executing their plans of conquest. The whole of Northumbria was soon subdued and ceased to be an Anglian state.

Soon after the conquest of Northumbria the Danes invaded the kingdom of Mercia, and occupied and fortified the town of Nottingham. The Mercians invited the West Saxons to come to their assistance, which they did under the leadership of King Athelred and his brother Alfred. They united their forces and attacked the Danes at Nottingham, but nothing decisive took place. The Danes, however, in the year 868, came to an agreement with the Mercians and retired to Northumbria. This temporary relief was due to the aid rendered by the West Saxons. After two or three years of preparation the Danes set out from Northumbria in the year 870 with the view of striking a blow for the conquest of the West Saxons and obtaining the supremacy of the whole of England. They marched through a portion of Mercia in the direction of East Anglia, destroying churches, monasteries, and towns, captured and plundered Peterborough, Huntingdon, and Ely, and the noted monastery of Croyland. They advanced into East Anglia, where they were joined by fresh bands of invaders, and after several battles they captured the country and put to a cruel death the king Eadmond. Such was war in those days. Thus the whole country north of the Thames was subdued by the Danes, and there remained only the kingdom of the West Saxons and its dependencies. The number of the Danes greatly increased by fresh bands of invaders. By the concentration of their increased forces they carried everything before them in the south of England. They arrived at Reading, then an important Saxon stronghold, and they occupied it without striking a blow and made it their headquarters for future operations.

The West Saxons were not prepared for this movement ; nevertheless the ealdorman of the district, Ethelwulf, with a small body of men, encountered a portion of the advancing Danes and held them in check until four days later Athelred and Alfred arrived before Reading. The two armies soon came into collison near Reading, but though the Saxons had the advantage in one part of the engagement, they were finally obliged to retire and cross the Thames near Windsor. In four days afterwards the contending forces met again in battle at Alcesdune, supposed to be the modern Ashdown. The battle was terrific ; both sides brought up all their forces and exerted themselves to the utmost as in a death struggle. Owing to the valour and skill of Alfred, the Danes were defeated and many of their leaders slain. In two weeks afterwards, the Danes having been reinforced by fresh invaders who proceeded up the Thames, the foes came into collison at Basing. The result was not decisive, but the Danes maintained their ground. They were again reinforced, and the West Saxons retired to the interior. At Merton King Athelred and Alfred took up a defensive position ; during the day the Saxons appeared to

be victorious on the field, but their losses of men and leaders were so great that they were compelled at night to retire. Soon after the battle King Athelred died, April 23rd, in the year 871, and Alfred became king of the West Saxons, the only kingdom now remaining free from the domination of the Danes.

When Alfred became king, the circumstances of his dominion were very adverse. After some hesitation and delay he led his troops against his enemy the Danes and fought the battle of Wilton in Wiltshire. The Danes gained the victory. The Saxon kingdom was nearly exhausted, and there seemed but little prospect of maintaining its independence by force of arms. Alfred, with the consent of his nobles, bribed the Danes with a large sum of money to leave the kingdom. By this means rest was secured for a time. The Danes now crossed the Thames, took up winter quarters near London, and resolved to complete the conquest of Mercia. By means of large money payments they were induced to leave the kingdom of Mercia and transport themselves by their ships from London to Northumbria. They did not, however, keep their engagement long, but invaded Mercia and penetrated into the interior. Repton in Derbyshire fell without a blow, and the Mercian king fled and died a pilgrim in Rome in the year 874. The whole of Mercia was conquered and a dependent king appointed by the Danes. Derby, Nottingham, Leicester, Stamford, and Lincoln became fortresses of the Danes in the very heart of the country.

From Mercia the Danes advanced in two armies to gain fresh conquests. One army proceeded to the north, to the district of the Tyne, and to those districts which were inhabited principally by the Britons—Cumberland and Strathclyde. In these regions they spread desolation in every direction. The second army was commanded by the renowned Guthrum. He marched into East Anglia, here to prepare for the attack next year on the kingdom of Wessex. Early in the year 876 the Danes quitted their winter quarters at Cambridge and proceeded towards the west. They went in their ships and landed unexpectedly at Wareham, in Dorsetshire, and soon seized the town. King Alfred offered them money to quit his kingdom. They greedily accepted the money, but immediately broke their oaths and continued the work of conquest. From Dorsetshire they proceeded to Devonshire, and resolved to capture Exeter. This important town was then in the joint occupation of the Saxons and the Welsh by arrangement, as shown elsewhere. They occupied separate parts of the town, but evidently they were not on friendly terms. The Danes allied themselves with the Welsh. Exeter was ultimately compelled by starvation to surrender. The attempt of the Danes left at Wareham to proceed to the aid of their brethren in Devonshire failed through misty weather and the activity of Alfred's fleet, which drove the Danish ships on the rocks of Swanage. Although Exeter was

surrendered, the Danes again agreed to leave Wessex, and they proceeded in the direction of Mercia. Gloucester was then in the possession of the Danes, and there they arrived. In the meantime a fresh band of Danes landed in South Wales and joined their brethren. They advanced into Wiltshire and surprised Alfred by the occupation of Chippenham and ravaged the country. This was in the winter of the year 878. The surprise was great, and Alfred was unable with his small forces to stand against the Danes, who spread through the west and were everywhere triumphant. The great Alfred had to seek life and safety for himself and his country in temporary obscurity. The difficulties of the situation were increased by the presence in the west of considerable numbers of the Britons or the Welsh, who had suffered for generations from the oppression of the Saxons, and were naturally disposed to aid the Danes against their oppressors. The hopes of the West Saxons were gone and their kingdom was in ruins, but Alfred was still alive and meditating in seclusion on the best method of rescuing his country from oppression and servitude. He had retired to a fort hastily constructed in the Isle of Athelney, in Somersetshire.

In the year 878 Alfred went forth from the fortress and gathered around him a band of choice patriots to begin the movement which was to free his country from the oppressor. He planted his standards in Selwood Forest, and thither the men of Somerset, Wilts, Hants, and Devon gathered when they heard that Alfred was still alive. An army was soon assembled, and Alfred marched towards Chippenham, then the headquarters of the Danes. The two armies met near Athandune, the modern Eddington, near Westbury. A desperate battle was fought, in which the Danes were defeated and many of them were slain or captured, and the remainder sought refuge in the castle of Chippenham. This place was soon besieged by Alfred, and the Danes were compelled by hunger and terror to request permission to leave the country. The request was granted, but before they departed the Danish leader, Guthrum, became a Christian, was baptized in the camp of Alfred, and a treaty was made by which the country north of the Thames and Watling Street should be assigned to the Danes. This large district included East Anglia, Northumbria, and a part of Mercia, the other part being handed over to the West Saxons. The country thus handed over to the Northmen was called the Danelagh. Thither Guthrum and his army proceeded, and ultimately settled down as Christians in this part of the country.

A portion of the Danes was not willing to become Christians or to settle down to a peaceful life, and, under the leadership of the pirate Hastings, they advanced to the south, but were defeated by Alfred, and then most of them with Hastings recrossed the seas or took refuge among the

Danes of Northumbria. The part of the country that remained under Alfred was Wessex, including London and the districts around, and the dependent kingdoms of Kent and Sussex. It also included districts north of the Thames formerly taken from Wessex by Wulfere, the king of the Mercians, but now ceded to Wessex under Alfred. This district, called also Mercia, was placed by Alfred under the governorship of his son-in-law, Ealdorman Ethelred.

Alfred was only thirty-one years of age when the peace with the Danes at Wedmore was made in the year 878. This peace secured for at least ten years rest for Wessex, during which Alfred devoted himself to the material, the intellectual, and moral welfare of the people. His benevolent activity has been elsewhere described. His life was, after the peace described, one devoted to literature, culture, education, and the internal welfare and happiness of his people. The Danish leader Guthrum, however, once more violated his oath and began a war, but was defeated by Alfred. By his success in war, saving Wessex from the Danes, and especially by his labours in promoting trade and commerce, the formation of a navy, the defence of his kingdom, and the advancement of education and the arts of peace, he earned the title of Alfred the Great. He ascended the throne of Wessex and of England in the year 871, when he was only twenty-two years of age, and he died in the year 901, aged only fifty-two, and he was interred at Winchester. He was the saviour of his country from the barbarism and the devastation of the Danes, and he did more than any previous monarch to promote the general welfare and happiness of the people.

After the death of Alfred, his nephew, Ethelwald, aspired to the throne and rebelled, but was obliged to flee. He was supported by a minority of the people, and with a small force he seized the town of Wimborne. Edward at once marched against him and pitched his camp four and a half miles from Wimborne at a place called Badbury. There is a hill which now bears the name of Badbury Rings in the district. Ethelwald, or Ethelwold, escaped and evaded the troops sent in his pursuit, and arrived in Northumbria. The Danes received him and placed him at the head of an expedition against Saxon territory, but they were defeated and Ethelwald slain. Edward the Elder, son of Alfred, was settled on the throne of Wessex. The Danes were still strong and active, and in the year 903 they brought from over the sea in a great Danish fleet large reinforcements. That portion of the kingdom of Mercia which had been ceded to Wessex under Alfred alone bore the name of Mercia. The remainder of Mercia was then called the "Five Boroughs," and consisted of Derby, Lincoln, Leicester —the old capital of Mercia—Stamford, and Nottingham. They embraced, of course, the territories of which these towns were the centres. The country was now strongly Danish, and

these five boroughs formed a Danish confederacy. Alfred had placed over Mercia his son-in-law, Ethelred, as sub-king. His wife, Ethelflaed, the daughter of Alfred, was as great a warrior as her husband, and was a partner in the government and in the wars. During their reign they were very successful against the Danes, resisting their attacks and carrying the war into Danish territory. The armies of Ethelred and Ethelflaed invaded the territories of the Danish confederacy, advancing along the Trent, and fortified Tamworth and Stafford. During the progress of this campaign news arrived that the Britons of Gwent, in South Wales, had risen in rebellion and crossed into Mercia. This led the warrior queen to change her march and to direct her course towards South Wales. She attacked and captured Brecknock, and the king, Owain, fled to the Danes, in whose aid he had risen. This is another instance in which the Welsh joined the Danes against the Saxons. They obtained no real good from them any more than from the Saxons. After this affair Ethelflaed marched into Mercia and captured Derby, and afterwards Leicester. In the capture of Derby Owain, the sub-king of Brecknock, who had fled hither, perished, probably by his own hands. After the surrender of Leicester, that of York followed. This terminated the brilliant career of Ethelflaed, the daughter of Alfred the Great, wife of Ethelred, sub-king of the Mercia which belonged to Wessex, and sister of Edward. Her husband died in the year 912. She herself died at Tamworth June 12, 920, after having rendered much assistance to her brother by many victories and by the erection of important fortresses, of which Tamworth was one. The province over which Ethelflaed ruled, specially called Mercia and belonging to Wessex, was formally annexed to Wessex and ruled by Edward direct after her death. She left a daughter, but she did not ascend the throne.

Edward now made an effort to subdue the whole region occupied by the Danes. The Danes of the north without any serious struggle submitted to Edward. The Danes of the Fens submitted, including Stamford and Nottingham. Manchester had been previously captured. Edward advanced into East Anglia and expelled the Danes from the southern and eastern coast as far as the Boston Wash, and shut them up in their northern provinces. The reign of Edward the Elder was thus successful in bringing the Danes under control and restricting them to more definite limits in the north and in our midland counties—the ancient Mercia. He died in the year 925, after a reign of twenty-four years, spent mostly in war with the Danes, and was interred at Winchester.

Edward left five sons and nine daughters, not the children of the same wife, and some, according to modern notions, would be deemed illegitimate. The son who succeeded to the throne was Athelstan, said by some to be the natural son of Edward. His mother was Egwin. She is differently described—by some as a noble lady, by others as a shepherd's daughter, others as not a

wife in the full sense of the term. Anyhow, Athelstan was designated by Edward in his will as his successor. The princes and peoples of ancient times of all races were not very strict in their conceptions of matrimony and legitimacy. It was common to recognise "natural children," and to allow them to partake in all the privileges of the family. Athelstan was crowned at Kingston by the archbishop of Canterbury. He was about thirty years of age when he began his reign. He made an early effort to conciliate the Danes of Northumbria by giving one of his sisters in marriage to the Danish king Sihtric, on condition that he should be baptized. His subjects, however, who were still pagans and strongly opposed to the English alliance, disapproved of the king's conduct and murdered him the following year. Sihtric left two sons by a former marriage, and both were expelled from Northumbria. Northumbria was now again in a condition of excitement and revolt against English supremacy. Athelstan marched an army to the north, and captured the strong fortress which the Danes had constructed at York, the capital of Northumbria. He proceeded further northward, even into Scotland. An alliance was formed against him by the Danes, the Scotch, and the Welsh of Cumbria and Strathclyde. Athelstan having defeated the confederacy and annexed Northumbria to England, the kings of Cumbria and Strathclyde as well as the Danes now acknowledged the supremacy of the English king. Athelstan has been called the first English king that really reigned over the entire country. There met in his Witenagemote, or great council, Danish earls, Welsh princes, nobles, and theigns from the north and the east, and the primates of the Church, north and south, bearing testimony to the unity of the country and the supremacy of Wessex, resulting in the oneness of England. In the west, occupied by the Britons mainly, another conflict took place between the Britons and the West Saxons, which resulted in the expulsion of the Welsh from Exeter across the Tamar as previously described. This was in the year 926.

For some years after the events described the king and the country had peace ; but another formidable confederacy was created against him. In the year 937 Anlaf, son of Guthfrith of Northumbria, arrived on the northern coast with a fleet of over six hundred ships, bringing over a large number of Danes. The appearance of this fleet was the signal for a reunion of Scots under Constantine, Owen King of Cumberland, and other British princes, and even some of the English race who joined Anlaf against Athelstan. The English king at once gathered his forces and marched against the invaders and the confederates. The result was the great battle of Brunanburgh, or the modern town of Bamborough. The confederates were severely defeated. The Welsh of Cumbria were badly handled by Athelstan. The English army also suffered very much, and many important persons were slain, including two cousins of the king. This great victory was long after celebrated in song, and seemed to be the ruin of the Danish cause, but was not except for

a time. Athelstan did not owe any kindness to the Welsh, who, in the west and in the north, sided with the Danes against the Anglo-Saxons. He was not content to punish the Britons of Cumbria and Strathclyde, but he inflicted his revenge on the Welsh of North Wales, or Gwynedd, and compelled their king to pay him tribute as an acknowledgment of his supremacy. The king was then called the king of Aberfraw, because the royal residence was at that place in Anglesea.

Athelstan survived only three years after the great battle of Brunanburgh, dying in October, 940, after a reign of only fifteen years, and was buried at Malmesbury, where his tomb may be seen in the Abbey Church, which is the remains of the great ancient monastery. He was only forty-six years of age when he died. It is remarkable that nearly all the old kings had a short life. Alfred was only fifty-two when he died, and his son Edward the Elder reigned only twenty-four years. There can be no doubt that Athelstan was a great monarch, and that he extended and strengthened the Anglo-Saxon power in every direction. When he died the Danes had been subdued for a time ; the ancient Britons were in the west restricted to Cornwall; in the north they were conquered and had to submit, and North Wales had to pay tribute to the Saxon king. Athelstan did much for the internal improvement of his kingdom. He improved the administration of the law, securing justice for the poor and providing for the destitute, and he placed trade under wise regulations. His alliances with foreign rulers were numerous and influential. His sisters were married to foreign princes—German, Gallic, and of the Netherlands. Athelstan had never been married and therefore left no son and heir.

He was succeeded on the throne by his half-brother Edmund the First, the youngest son of Edward the Elder. He was only eighteen years of age when he became king, many years younger than his brother Athelstan, and he was only three years of age when his father died. He had, however, seen something of public and warlike life, for he had taken a part in the battle of Brunanburgh three years before he ascended the throne, when he was only fifteen years of age. The Danes who had been conquered at Brunanburgh were not subdued. In the year 941 the Danes of Northumbria rose against the English domination and placed Anlaf at their head. They were joined by the Danes of Mercia. The archbishop of York, whose name was Wulfstan and was of Danish blood, in the year 942 declared in favour of the Danish cause and joined Anlaf in the command of the army. It was no uncommon thing in ancient times for ecclesiastics who professed to be men of peace and goodwill to join in the operations of war. Wulfstan was of this stamp, and showed that he belonged to the Church militant. The Danes under Anlaf and Wulfstan advanced into the dominions of the English and defeated them at Tamworth, which formerly was a great Saxon stronghold. The English, however, soon recovered themselves. They successfully attacked and captured Mercia and the five towns which constituted an important

portion of the old Mercia. A treaty was then formed through the negotiation of the two archbishops, Wulfstan and Odo, and Edmund agreed to cede to the Danes the country north of Watling Street, and Anlaf was to acknowledge Edmund the overlord of the entire land. This agreement did not last long. Anlaf died soon after the treaty was made, and his country was divided into two and assigned to another Anlaf and to Regnault. This did not continue long. In 944 the English Edmund drove them both out of the country and again united the Danelagh to England.

The ancient Britons of the north from the time of the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons constituted themselves into an independent or semi-independent state bearing the name of Cumbria and Strathclyde. This has been shown in various parts of this history. They occupied the hilly portion of the country extending from the Dee to the Clyde, and included the modern counties of Cheshire, Lancashire, and parts of West Yorkshire, Westmorland, and Cumberland. The boundary varied at different times according to the fortunes of war. These Britons were warlike and were often troublesome to the Anglo-Saxons, and sometimes joined the Danes and other enemies of the English. As soon as Edmund had disposed of the Danes, he directed his attention to the Briton and harried all Cumbria. Having occupied the country, he agreed to hand it over to Malcolm the First, king of Scotland, who was the son of Constantine, who had joined the Danes and the Britons against the English. This measure was a prudent one, for the Britons gave no trouble to England for a long time afterwards. Malcolm, however, was obliged to do homage to the English king for this province and protect the northern counties from the ravages of the Danes.

The reign of Edmund was very short—only six years. He was murdered on the 26th of May in the year 946 or 947. He was observing the feast of St. Augustine of Canterbury at Pucklechurch in Gloucestershire when a public robber, whose name was Leofa, entered the hall where the king was and took his seat at the table near to the king. The cupbearer tried to put him out, but the robber drew his sword and the king went to the assistance of his officer, and in the contest the robber drew his dagger and stabbed the king to his heart.

The children of Edmund were young, as he was only twenty-four when he died. His brother Edred succeeded him on the throne. The Danes and their usual confederates again revolted and placed on the throne Eric, a son of Harold Blue-tooth, the Danish king. Edred marched against the revolted province and ravaged it. The Northumbrians did not offer any serious opposition to his advance. The entire result was the defeat of the confederates, and the Scotch king was compelled to renew his homage for Cumbria, or Cumberland, the land of the Cymry. One important event of this reign was the final submission of Northumbria and its change from a sub-kingdom into an earldom; and the first earl was Oswulf, an Englishman. After a reign of

only nine years Edred died. He was born about the year 924, and died at Frome in Somersetshire the 23rd of November, in the year 955. He was thus only thirty-one years of age. He was always a great sufferer from disease, and possibly this led some later writers to describe him as worn out with old age.

Edred was succeeded on the throne by his nephew Edwin, or Edwy, whose reign was brief, for he died in the year 958 only nineteen years of age. The chief feature of his reign was the contest between him and Dunstan, the monk of Glastonbury, to which reference has been already made. The life of Dunstan has been mixed up with miracles and myths. He was born in the year 920 near Glastonbury. His parents were rich and were connected with noble families. Two relatives were bishops of Wells and Winchester. His brother was steward of the estates belonging to the celebrated Abbey of Glastonbury. Dunstan received his early education at the school belonging to the abbey. He made great progress in his studies. He devoted himself to literature, and became a learned and accomplished man. Ultimately he became an ecclesiastical statesman and rose to the highest position in the state. He was ordained at an early age, then he became a monk at Glastonbury, and during the reign of Edmund he became priest and was appointed the abbot of Glastonbury. He had been a fellow-student of King Edred, and when he came to the throne Dunstan became one of his chief advisers in the affairs of the state, whilst remaining abbot of the monastery. The great ecclesiastical contest of the times was between the Secular and the Regular clergy. The latter were so called because they, as monks, bound themselves to live according to the *rules* or *Regulæ* of the monastic orders. The others were the clergy who discharged their duties connected with parish churches, and in the modern sense were the only proper clergy. They were not bound by strict rules; and they lived in the world, the *seculum*, as then understood. The contest between these parties related to some extent as to the possession of the cathedrals. Another matter of dispute was the celibacy of the clergy. The Secular or parochial clergy were mostly married men, even in this tenth century, but the Regular clergy were monks, and of course were unmarried, whatever may have been the practice of their life. The bishops then, as in many other ages, favoured the Regular clergy, who were the most priestly in their conceptions and practices.

Dunstan resided in the monastery, did much to enlarge the buildings and to improve the discipline among the monks, who, as in many other ages, were not as good as they should be. Like the most faithful and genuine monks, he employed himself in manual labour. His special labour was that of the forge. The story is well known of him that the devil came to his cell and tempted him. Dunstan put his tongs into the furnace, and when it became white hot he took it and caught the jaws or the nose of the devil, who cried out and fled. The story is of course mythical. The ecclesiastical notions of the devil were then different from those

of modern times. They conceived of the devil as a visible and material being, possessing material organs which can be seized. In modern times where there is any belief in the existence of a devil, the head of a race of demons, he is conceived of as an invisible and spiritual being who has power to act on the minds of men through the spiritual laws that govern the mind, but not in the way of miracle.

King Edwy did not like Dunstan, and they soon came into conflict. He was crowned by Odo, the archbishop of Canterbury, in the early part of 956. At the feast following the coronation Edwy was found missing, and Dunstan and other nobles were sent to find him. He was found in the company of Elgiva, his intended wife, and her mother, and was compelled to return to the feast. In the year 957 Edwy married the beautiful Elgiva. Dunstan and his party were opposed to the marriage on the ground that they were related within the prohibited degrees. This has been previously described. When priests and partisans want an excuse for their hostility they will soon find one. They do not seem particularly anxious to protect royal persons and others from *real vice*, from fornication or having concubines, but some artificial and ecclesiastical point of no real consequence is fixed upon as the ground of their opposition. The consequence of the quarrel was that some of the partisans retired from the court and went and proclaimed the king's younger brother Edgar king of Northumbria and Mercia. In the meantime Dunstan had been banished. The kingdom was now divided. Edgar in the north recalled Dunstan, and made him afterwards bishop of Worcester, and archbishop of Canterbury in 961, after Odo's death. Odo pronounced the marriage void and went over to the party of Edgar. In the year 957 Edwy died, or was murdered, and Edgar in 958 succeeded to the throne of England, and Dunstan became not only the archbishop but the chief person in the Government. The reign of Edgar was peaceful. The Danes ceased to trouble England, but Edgar sent a force to Ireland to oppose them and captured Dublin. Edgar's chief conflict was with the Welsh. The king of North Wales, whose name was Idwal, refused to pay the tribute due to England as the supreme power. Edgar invaded the country and conquered the king. The Welsh submitted. The tribute was then changed into the annual payment of three hundred heads of wolves. The object was to destroy the wolves that had become destructive. Also the Celtic princes—sub-kings of Scotland, Cumbria, the Hebrides, Strathclyde, and Wales—met Edgar at Chester in the year 973 and rowed him in a vessel—a barge—to the monastery of St. John the Baptist, there joined in worship, and then returned to the palace at Chester. This ceremony was evidently intended as an act of homage to the English king.

During the reign of Edgar Dunstan was the prime minister, and, apart from his priestly pretensions, governed the kingdom fairly well. The administration of the law was wisely regulated, the

purity of the coinage was secured, and the weights and measures, of much practical importance, were adjusted. Something like fairness was done to the different nationalities of the king—Welsh and Danes. Of course Dunstan did not overlook his claims as the representative of the Church. He was made bishop of Worcester and London, and finally archbishop of Canterbury after the death of Odo in the year 961. Edgar died in the year 975 after a peaceful reign of sixteen years. He was only thirty-two or thirty-three years of age when he died ; he was thus only a boy when he ascended the throne, and was only a young man when he died—another illustration of the short life of the kings of that period.

Edgar left two sons—Edward, afterwards called the Martyr, and Ethelred, also designated the Unready—the former thirteen years of age and the latter only seven when their father died. They were the children of different mothers. The mother of the younger, whose name was Elgiva, claimed the throne for her son on some ground perhaps because Edgar was not crowned when Edward was born ; but this applied equally to both sons, as the formal ceremony of coronation did not take place until 973, only two years before his death. Probably there was some defect in the matter of legitimacy, not uncommon in those days. Edward, however, reigned only three and a half years, when he was murdered. This took place by the instigation of his stepmother at Corfe Castle in Dorsetshire. He was interred at Wareham, but afterwards was re-interred at Shaftesbury with royal honours.

Ethelred succeeded to the throne, and was crowned in the year 979 at Kingston when only eleven years of age. The kingdom was feeble, and its defences, naval and military, had much declined. The Danes, as pirates and robbers, recommenced their old work. They landed in Kent, and pillaged the country. Another body arrived in several ships at Southampton, and others appeared on the eastern coast. A band of them also landed near Chester and ravaged the country. The king was indolent and was surrounded by flatterers. Dunstan, the ecclesiastical statesman, died in the year 988, and his successors in office had not his ability or integrity. Instead of driving the barbarians from his country, the king offered them money—£10,000—to leave his kingdom. Accepting the money, they left by their ships, but only to return with greater forces. They did return in numerous ships, sailed up the Humber, and landed. The English who occupied the districts where they landed offered resistance, but the Danes who resided there joined their fellow-Danes. The whole of the north was soon at their feet. The Danes of Northumbria even forsook their Christianity and joined their pagan brethren. Soon afterwards a fleet of eighty warships arrived in the Thames, commanded by two kings—Sweyn of Denmark and Olaf of Norway. Ethelred again offered them money. They accepted £80,000, but continued their insolence and violence without any restraint.

In order to destroy an enemy which was beyond the military

power of Ethelred to conquer, he planned a secret massacre, and on one day, by general agreement, the Danes were secretly and treacherously slain. The massacre, however, was limited to the south, where the Danes were a minority; but in Northumbria they were the majority and the plan was not there executed. This massacre of the Danes took place on St. Brice's Day in the year 1002 or 1003. The excuse given was that the Danes themselves were plotting to massacre him and his nobles, but this was probably a mere excuse to palliate a great crime. The real reason was that the king had been defeated in so many battles and was unable to overcome the Danes in honourable warfare. The effect of the massacre on the Danes of Denmark was great, and produced a spirit of retaliation. A sister of Sweyn, then king of Denmark, who was married to an English nobleman, was murdered. This stirred the wrath of Sweyn. He had formerly been a pirate, but now he was king of Denmark and he determined that he would be king of England. He collected a great army and transported it to England by means of a fleet of large ships. The army disembarked on the southern shore somewhere near Exeter. The English army was commanded by Elfric, who was a traitor. This was in the year 1003. The Danes had no difficulty in conquering the English. They soon ravaged and conquered the southern and south-western counties. The English people grew tired of a king like Ethelred, who was continually robbing them for his own and Danish purposes, and they lost heart in the contest and were inclined to submit to the Danes. The Danes accepted another bribe, but as usual broke their promise. In 1005 there was some measure of peace. The Danish fleet returned, but in the year 1006 it came back with reinforcements, and the war was carried on with greater vigour. Portions of the Midland counties spontaneously submitted to Sweyn. Oxford and Winchester—two of the most important in the south-west—opened their gates to the invaders. Sweyn advanced through the west as far as the Bristol Channel and proclaimed himself king of England. Ethelred, abandoned by his own subjects, fled first to the Isle of Wight and then to Normandy, where he sought the hospitality of his brother-in-law, Richard of Normandy, where he joined his wife. After many changes and much slaughter England submitted without much resistance. London was the only strong place that offered a long and vigorous defence, and was finally obliged to give in. In the course of the contest the archbishop of Canterbury was murdered (1012). The nobles of the west came to meet Sweyn at Bath, and submitted to him. Sweyn now became virtually king of England, though never crowned. He died, however, a few weeks after Ethelred's flight in the year 1014. The Danish leader, the son of Sweyn, Canute, succeeded his father. The Saxons were soon tired of the Danes, and through the assembly of nobles and bishops invited Ethelred to return, if he would promise to govern more righteously. This promise he made, conveyed through his son Edward, and shortly appeared

among his people. He became king of a portion of the western kingdom. After several unsuccessful battles Ethelred died in the year 1016.

Edmund, the natural son of Ethelred, succeeded his father. He was called Edmund Ironsides because of his strength or the armour he wore. He was a brave prince and fought many severe battles against Canute and the Danes, and was victorious in several ; but the people were tired of war, and Edmund and Canute were induced to meet on an island in the Severn, and there they agreed to divide the country among them—Edmund to reign over the southern portion and Canute over the northern portion of the country. A large portion of the north was occupied by the Danes, including Northumbria and Mercia, comprehending our Midland counties, and they formed a sprinkling of the people of some parts of the south. The division was thus a reasonable one. Such divisions are commonly only of short duration. After a reign of nine months Edmund died, or more probably was murdered, November 30, 1016.

The death of Edmund led to a dispute. Canute contended that by the agreement the survivor should become king of the entire country. This, supported by force behind, prevailed and Canute the Dane early in the year 1017 was crowned king of England. The evil genius of the Saxon kings was Edric, who proved traitor to Ethelred and Edmund. He was made by Canute earl of Mercia and afterwards put to death. Other nobles were got rid of by death or banishment. A heavy tax, called a Danegelt, was soon imposed upon the kingdom, amounting to £82,500—a tenth of it from London, an evidence of the importance of the city then. Apart from some cruel deeds, Canute tried to conciliate his Saxon subjects. He married the widow of Ethelred, and he became a Christian and honoured the memories of Saxon saints, and professed to establish equal justice among all his subjects. For purposes of government he divided England into four provinces—namely, Wessex, Mercia, East Anglia, and Northumbria. The south-western part of England, though conquered and garrisoned by the Danes, was not to any extent peopled by them ; and Canute tried to conciliate the Saxons by sending the greater number of his troops back to Denmark, retaining only a few thousands as his bodyguard. The result was that the Saxon districts remained substantially the same as they were before the invasion of Sweyn—the Danes remaining as a body in the Midland counties, Northumbria, and East Anglia. Canute secured peace in England during his reign, and he attempted to make use of English troops to enable him to bring under his dominion Norway and Sweden, thus to become king of England, Denmark, and the two northern countries. The improvements which he effected by legislation comprehended the following : Justice was to be administered with a regard to human life equally to the rich and the poor and to all races alike ; the slave trade was to be prohibited ; pagan and superstitious rites were forbidden and to be punished, such as the

worship of trees, stones, or fountains, and sun and moon ; the two systems of law—Danish and English—were to be confined to the districts as previously—the Danish where the Danes resided and the English where the English people dwelt ; the dues due to the king were to be lightened and regulated.

Canute died in the year 1035, after a reign of eighteen years. He left three sons to inherit his dominions. The eldest, Sweyn, became king of Norway, of which during his father's life he was the vicegerent. The second son, Harold, became king of England, but not without dispute. The third son—whose mother was Emma, the widow of Ethelred—whose name was Hardicanute, was away in Denmark, where he had been acting as deputy to his father. There was a contest as to who should be king of England—Harold or Hardicanute. The dispute nearly ended in a bloody civil war. A compromise was made by both sides. Harold was assigned to the Danish part of England, namely, Mercia, Northumbria, and probably East Anglia ; and Hardicanute was assigned to the south and the west of England. He was the son of Emma, and she acted as regent until her son returned from Denmark. The capital of the southern kingdom was Winchester. The two sons of Ethelred, Alfred and Edward, whose mother also was Emma, claimed the throne of England and tried to enforce it, but failed in the attempt.

During the reign of Canute, as previously shown, England was divided into four provinces or earldoms. The earls of these provinces played an important part in the events of the times. The earl of Wessex was Godwin, and the administration during the regency of Emma was mainly in his hands. Harold did not long reign over the Danish portion of England and died in 1039. In the year 1037, however, he had been made king of all England owing to the dissatisfaction on the ground that Hardicanute did not return to England to assume the position of king, to which he had been appointed. In the year 1039, after the death of Harold, Hardicanute left Denmark, and in the following year he arrived in England, having been previously appointed king of all England. This last Danish king ruled with a rod of iron. He burdened the Saxons with taxes too heavy to be borne and inflicted upon them the greatest injustice. He died June 8, 1041, at a public feast, and the English long rejoiced at his death.

After the death of Hardicanute the English, under the leadership of Earl Godwin and his son, determined to assert their independence and rose against their Danish oppressors. They captured place after place and drove the Danes northward until the whole of the south and west was free from the Danes and in the possession and under the government of the English. Then they selected as king Edward, the younger son of Ethelred.

The rule of the Danes came to an end by the death of Hardicanute, who left no heir and was apparently never married. The history of the Danes in this country had three stages. They came first as rovers and pirates to plunder the coasts and the inhabitants

of the interior. This continued from the latter part of the eighth century to the middle of the ninth century. Their first appearance seems to have been in the year 787 on the south-western coast. Their visits afterwards were frequent and continuous to different parts of the country, especially to the north and north-east. Their visits as pirates came to an end about the year 855. Thence they came as settlers and occupied various districts, especially the ancient Northumbria and Mercia and, to some extent, East Anglia. They became numerous and powerful and the masters of the north, and ultimately the conquerors of England under Sweyn, Canute, and Hardicanute. The story of Canute in the height of his power ordering the waves and the tides of the sea to obey him is well known. The purpose of his conduct was to teach a lesson to his fulsome courtiers that all men must bow before the laws of the universe.

The result of the long contests between the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes was that the country was divided into two great portions—the south and the north ; in the former the Anglo-Saxons prevailed and in the latter the Danes. The marks of this great division are apparent even in modern times, though the populations themselves are now mixed and largely homogeneous. The names which places now bear indicate the race that occupied and governed them. The word *by*, or in its full form *byr*, is Danish, and is common in Denmark. It denotes a dwelling, a farm settlement, and then a village, and corresponds to the Saxon *ham*. In the Danish district of England, north of Watling Street, the suffix *by* is very common and numerous. The following may be mentioned—Derby, Rugby, Kirby, Grimsby, Whitby, Ashby, Selby, Nertherby. In Lincolnshire alone—a large Danish district—about one hundred names having the suffix *by* are found. In the entire district north of Watling Street there are six hundred places containing this word. In the south of England there are scarcely any names ending in *by*. The word *thorp* in Danish means a village and is common in Denmark, and is found, but not so frequently as *by* in the north of England. These are the verbal monuments of the Danish colonies in England.

The result of this historical summary is that the south and south-western counties of England remained in the possession of the Anglo-Saxons mixed with a small portion of Danes ; and that the ancient kingdoms of Northumbria and East Anglia remained chiefly peopled by the Danes ; and that Mercia, or the central portion of the country was divided between the two peoples. Here and there were places occupied in the one territory by people belonging to the other living in peace and submission to each other, but the great mass of the two nationalities were divided by the line which ran through the middle of the country. The testimony of language at this day points to the same conclusion. The prevalence of the *bys* and *thorps* testify to the Danish character of the inhabitants, and the *hams* and the *tons* to the Anglo-Saxons. The country between the Tees and the Forth was almost purely Anglo-Saxon,

In Devonshire there are a few place-names which indicate Danish settlements, mostly on the coast or along rivers. For instance, Beer-Alston was probably a small Danish colony formed when the Danes landed at Lidford in the year 997.

Gradually the two races, who were different branches of the Teutonic family, in the course of time became mixed until they ceased to be clearly distinguishable. The language of the Danes, which was near to the Saxon, never prevailed through the country, and ultimately was suppressed by the English. Englishmen often speak of their Anglo-Saxon forefathers, but many of them, especially those in the north and the Midland counties, might with greater propriety speak of their Danish forefathers. The fact is the English nation is the offspring of many races, of which the Anglo-Saxons were only one, and perhaps a minority of the whole. The Celtic element was very important in the composition of the English people—much more so than some historians are disposed to allow.

The Norwegians formed a portion of the Northmen or Scandinavians who invaded this country during the Anglo-Saxon period. They were to some extent mixed up with the Danes in their incursions. Nevertheless the Norwegians did make incursions of their own into different parts of Britain. They were made more quietly and directed mainly to the north of Scotland, the Isle of Man, the Lake districts of England, and a few other places. Some of their settlements were made peacefully and without any intended injury to the people whose land they invaded. From an early period the inhabitants of Norway and Iceland migrated to the north of Scotland. Until the year 1266, the Shetlands, the Orkneys, the Hebrides, and the Isle of Man were dependencies or earldoms of Norway. From these islands the Norwegians would easily migrate to the mainland of Scotland. The extreme north-west is now called Sutherland, or Southland, which it could not have been to the Britons, the Saxons, or the Scotch ; but to the Norwegians who resided on the northern island this would be the Southland of their possessions. The bishopric of Sodor and Man was established by the Norwegians. They called the Hebrides Sudreyjar, or Southern Island, translated by the English term Sodor. The ancient diocese was the Hebrides and the Isle of Man. Originally they were two dioceses, but in the eleventh century they were united into one and made dependent on the archbishop of Troudhjun in Norway, and this continued till the year 1334. The earldom of the Isle of Man created by the Norwegians was continued long after it ceased to be dependent on Norway, and was held by the duke of Athol, and his peculiar rights were tranferred to the British crown in the year 1764. The inhabitants of the Isle of Man were Celtic anterior to the Norwegian incursions ; and, according to Canon Taylor, of the 400 place-names in the island, 59 per cent. are Celtic and 20 per cent. Norse.

The Norwegians advanced from the islands to the English coast, and formed settlements in Lancashire, Westmorland, and Cumber-

land. These districts at that time were occupied chiefly by the Britons or Welsh, who had found in the mountains a refuge from the Anglo-Saxons. The Norwegians appear to have made these settlements quietly, and lived on friendly terms with the native Britons. The whole of these districts abound with Norwegian names, such as *thwaite*, *fell*, *gill*, and *wick*. Taylor estimates these place-names as 124 in Cumberland and 125 in Westmorland. In Cheshire the Norwegians made at least one settlement, the district between the Mersey and the Dee, called Wirral. Most of the places in this small district bear Norse names. They made also some small settlements in Wales, especially in Pembrokeshire, as indicated by the names of places. They sailed round the Welsh coasts, and visited several places to which they gave their names, even when no settlements were made. Sometimes the Flemish names in Pembrokeshire have been mistaken for Norwegian. These Flemings migrated from Flanders to Pembrokeshire when a part of their country was submerged by the sea. This was in the twelfth century. They were a very skilful and industrious people. They were not very numerous, and united with the natives and disappeared as a separate people. The Norwegian settlers were not numerous, and in a short course of time they were absorbed by the Britons and the Danes. They added, however, to the complex character of the nation. The Danish, the Welsh, the Norwegian, and the Flemish elements formed probably a majority over the Anglo-Saxons.

The Danish dynasty came to an end by the death of Hardicanute, who was only twenty-three or twenty-four years of age when he died. With the dynasty also passed away the supremacy of the Danes for ever. The people were tired of the Danes, and they elected in 1042 Edward as their king. His father was Ethelred and his mother was the daughter of the duke of Normandy, Emma, first married to Ethelred and afterwards to Canute the Dane. Edward, who had spent much of his life in Normandy, was not at first disposed to ascend the throne until persuaded by Earl Godwin. He was crowned on the 3rd of April, 1043, at Winchester, in the presence of many foreign ambassadors. He was thirty-eight years of age. The governing spirit was Godwin, whose daughter Edith Edward married in the year 1045. The reign was not undisturbed. Magnus of Norway claimed the English throne, but nothing came of the claim. Another source of trouble came from Godwin and his family. Godwin placed himself at the head of the English party *versus* the Norman, which Edward favoured. Godwin had six sons who were raised to positions of power in the state. They were Sweyn, Harold, Tostig, Gurth, Leofwine, and Wulfnoth. The eldest, Sweyn, was made earl of a large district, including Hereford, Gloucester, Oxford, Berks, and Somerset. Harold was made earl of East Anglia. The others were raised to positions of influence. Sweyn was a man of evil habits, and committed many crimes, including

the abduction of the abbess of Leominster and the murder of his cousin Beorn. He had resigned his earldom and retired to Flanders in consequence of the abduction. Returning to England, he managed to get his cousin into his power, and murdered him as he had been appointed to be earl of a part of Sweyn's province. After his return to England he was placed in his old position in the year 1051. He went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land to atone for his crimes, and died in an obscure place on his return. Godwin himself was banished in the year 1051, but returned in the following year, 1052, and soon after died.

The government of Godwin and the insolence of his sons became intolerable, and they were all banished, including even the wife of the king, who was placed under the charge of an abbess. The banishment, as stated, did not last long. After some battles fought in different parts of the country, the great earl and his family were restored, and the Norman leaders fled over the Channel. The death of Godwin took place in 1053. The account of his death which has come down to us is largely legendary. The Godwin family again attained to positions of influence and power, and Harold was made earl of Wessex in succession to his father. The king, Edward, was called the Confessor because of his supposed sanctity, but much of his good qualities was manufactured long after his death. He died on January 5, 1066, and Harold, the son of Godwin, was chosen king of England.

The reign of Edward was marked by some Danish invasions and many internal discords, but we must not conclude this chapter without referring to the wars between the English under Harold and the Welsh. The Welsh often joined the Danes against the Anglo-Saxons. When the Danes in the year 1049 arrived on the western coast in their ships, they sailed up the Bristol Channel, the Welsh king Gruffydd joined them in an attack on the English, and defeated them under the bishop of Worcester. In the year 1063 Earl Harold organised a campaign against the Welsh in retaliation for previous Welsh invasions and losses inflicted on the English. Thus in the year 1053 the king of the Welsh, Gruffydd or Griffith, commenced another war on the borders, and defeated the English who issued from the castle of Leominster in Herefordshire. In the year 1054 the Welsh united with a force under Elfgar, son of Leofric of Mercia, an outlaw, who had raised a force in Ireland. The united forces marched into Herefordshire. They were met by the English who were led by the Norman Rudulf, who had been made earl of the west country. The English army was defeated and fled. The Welsh and their allies then marched against Hereford, captured the city, and burnt it and the cathedral after the custom of the times. With much booty and many prisoners the Welsh retired to South Wales. In the following year Gruffydd, the king of Wales, again invaded England, and succeeded, though he had not then the assistance of Elfgar, who had been reconciled to the English king, and had been restored to his earldom. The commander of the English forces in this

campaign was the bishop of Hereford, whose name was Leofgar. In those days bishops were appointed not because of their spiritual qualities but for state reasons, and they were often warriors and generals. After a time the war came to an end and peace made, the Welsh king agreeing to do homage to King Edward of England. In the year 1058 Elfgar was again banished and again united with King Gruffydd, and by his means was restored to his earldom.

These border wars went on for some time, and as announced above, Harold, the son of Godwin, organised an army, and in 1063 advanced against the Welsh into their own country. The English pursued the Welsh into the difficult region of Snowdon and other districts. The Welsh were defeated. The king fled, but in the year 1064 he was murdered by his own subjects, and his head was sent to the English king. Thus ended this war. Gruffydd was the "king over the whole Welsh race," that is the over-king—other kings and princes recognising his supremacy. He was a great warrior, and for many years maintained the independence and greatness of Wales. He was known as Gruffydd ab Llywelyn. The result of the war was that North Wales was given to the two half-brothers of Gruffydd, namely Bleddyn and Rhiwallon, who promised to pay tribute to the English king. The government of South Wales was given to Meredydd ab Owen.

CHAPTER XXII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE NINTH AND TENTH CENTURIES

The continuous history of the ancient Britons is not easily given, because it is so much mixed up with the history of the Anglo-Saxons and the other peoples who invaded and conquered Britain. The same historical facts come under our notice in different relations, and we are tempted to repeat the same story in different chapters though under varied aspects.

The Britons in ancient times were, like most other peoples, broken up into various tribes and clans without any effective centre of unity or compact political organisation. There was recognised a nominal head called at one time the gwledig, or the over-king, whose authority was nominally recognised. There were, however, so many petty kings and princes governing separate districts and claiming some kind of independence that the unity of the entire people was a mere shadow. "Memories of the old kingship and of the old bonds undoubtedly survived in theory and sometimes reappeared in fact, but, speaking broadly, the aspect that Wales presents during the succeeding centuries is that of a disunited or very loosely connected aggregate of clans, or petty kingdoms, or lordships engaged in perpetual warfare, both among themselves and with English kingdoms and English rulers. It would be untrue to state that there was absolutely no conception of a collective nation or of a united kingdom, but, so far as we can ascertain, it was only on two occasions that the whole country was effectively under the rule of one sovereign" (Blue Book, p. 113). This quotation may be regarded as a correct representation of the condition of the Britons during their separate existence, and is applicable to the period under review, but only to a lesser degree.

In the early part of the ninth century the Britons of Gwynedd, or North Wales, were in a divided condition, the result of their peculiar laws or customs regulating the property or patrimonial estate. The sons of Rhodri Maelwynawg, whose names were Hywel or Howel Vychan, or the little, and Cynan Tindaethwy quarrelled about their inheritance. This was at the beginning of the ninth century. Critics have observed that there must be some error in this matter, as Rhodri died in the year 754. Possibly these contending princes were grandsons of Rhodri. Howel contended

that he ought to have as his province of government Mona or Anglesey. Cynan was then king of Gwynedd, or North Wales. The quarrel resulted in a war between the brothers. In the first part of the war Howel was successful and took possession of the Isle of Anglesey ; but finally he was defeated and was compelled to abandon the island. In the year 816 or 817 Howel again attempted to gain his object, but he was entirely defeated. In the year 818 Cynan died, and Mervyn Vrych, the reigning prince of the Isle of Man, son-in-law of Cynan, succeeded him on the throne of Gwynedd. Howel, however, was allowed to ascend the throne of the Isle of Man, and ruled there for eight years, when he died. In the reign of Mervyn—who, it appears, was joint ruler of Gwynedd with his wife Essyllt, who was the daughter of Cynan the late king—the West Saxons invaded North Wales under Egbert, who was the over-king of England. They overran many lordships or districts in Gwynedd, made themselves masters of the mountainous region of Snowdon, then called Eryri, and then advanced over the straits and occupied the Isle of Mona, or Anglesey, after a severe battle fought at Llanvaes. In the year 828 Egbert led an army against North Wales, and the Britons submitted, acknowledging the supremacy of Egbert. About the same time, or a little earlier, the Mercians, then subordinate to the West Saxons, invaded South Wales, ravaged the kingdom of Dyved, and then got possession of the kingdom of Powys. There then followed a period of peace, but in the year 844 a battle was fought at Cyveiliog, in Montgomeryshire, when the king of Gwynedd—Mervyn—fell, and the crown of Gwynedd passed to a man of great ability and power—Rhodri Mawr or Rhodri the Great. This was the beginning of an important period in the history of Wales. He was the son of Mervyn, who fell in battle. According to the tradition and the Chronicles of the Welsh, Roderic the Great succeeded to the entire government of Wales. He obtained the government of Gwynedd and Powys from his father. He married Angharad, the daughter of Gwgan ab Meyrig, who was prince of South Wales, and with her he received the crown of South Wales. He thus became the monarch of the entire country. By this we must understand that he was the over-king of Wales, for there were other kings and princes possessed of governmental power during his reign. These were subordinate and subject kings, a state of things which was common in those ancient times. In the early part of his reign there was some measure of peace, which enabled Rhodri to give attention to the internal improvement of the country. His reign has been regarded as one of material and social progress. It has been said that Rhodri divided the kingdom into three principalities, namely, Gwynedd, Powys, and Deheubarth or South Wales, though there is some doubt whether Gwent was included in Deheubarth. It is difficult to reconcile this statement with facts which have come under our observation in the course of this history, where Gwynedd and Powys have appeared during several ages as distinct and separate states governed by

different princes. Even at the battle of Chester, in the year 613, Brochmael, prince of Powys, took a part in the conflict, though an inglorious one ; and in the eighth century Offa took the capital of Powys, Pengwern, and the name was changed into the Saxon Shrewsbury, having the same signification. It is certain that these principalities were not originated by Rhodri, but they may have been more united before his time, and he gave more definiteness to their distinct separation. It is certain, however, that Rhodri did divide his kingdom among his three sons, to take effect after his death. The eldest son bore the name of Anarawd, and he became king of Gwynedd, and he was also the over-king of Wales, the other kings and princes recognising him as supreme. Gwynedd in those ancient times was the chief state of Wales, especially from the time of Cunedda. The principality of Powys was assigned to Merfyn. This principality, as previously described, formed central Wales, part in our North Wales and part in South Wales. The third portion of Wales, called Deheubarth—embracing our South Wales with perhaps the exception of Gwent—was given to Cadell, another son of Rhodri. In all probability this division followed the ancient British tribal law of division, a law or custom which led to many petty disputes and wars among the Britons themselves, and contributed much to their weakness in their relation to their foreign foes.

The concluding period of Rhodri's reign was one of war. In the year 877 the English are reported as invading Wales and penetrating as far as Mona or Anglesey. This was during the time of Alfred the Great, and during a part of Alfred's reign when he was harassed by the Danes. The precise events of this period are not very well known. It is said in Anglo-Saxon history that Alfred was generally on friendly terms with the Welsh ; and it is doubtful whether the king of Gwynedd was a vassal of the English king at this time. The circumstances of this war are imperfectly known, and the precise chronology of the events has been variously represented. In this war the king Rhodri Mawr was slain, and the three sons mentioned entered upon their respective principalities. According to some historians, the division of Wales into three principalities or kingdoms was made by the three sons, not by their father Rhodri. There is, of course, some uncertainty in regard to these historical facts, but we prefer to receive the account which ascribes the division to Rhodri himself. The war in which Rhodri lost his life did not apparently change the condition of Wales in relation to the Saxon kingdom, then under the government of Alfred the Great struggling against the Danes. The nominal submission of the country to the Anglo-Saxons has been represented by historians during the most prosperous period of Alfred's reign. If it did exist, it was merely nominal, and the tribute said to be due was not actually paid.

The death of Rhodri took place in the year 877, but the new reign of his sons did not continue long without war, according to British account. The tradition is that many of the Cumbrians, or

Welsh of Cumbria, refused to submit to the English in the north, migrated to North Wales, and were received by the king of Gwynedd, who gave them lands in the district lying between the Dee and the Clwyd. In doing this, certain English settlers were displaced and driven over the border into Mercia. The sub-king of Mercia, who claimed the territory from which they had been expelled, prepared an expedition to avenge the wrong and to recover the territory. A war ensued. The English advanced into Gwynedd, and the Welsh gradually retired, carrying with them all their removable property and cattle. Then the Welsh king of Gwynedd, Anarawd, placed himself at the head of his army and marched out from Conway to a place called Cynryd, two miles distant, and there a battle was fought, which resulted in a victory for the Welsh, who drove the English beyond the borders. The north Britons, who during the war had to leave their possessions in the district called Tegeingle or Tegangle and in the Clwyd, were reinstated. The district called Tegangle was situated about Prestatyn, probably, according to Pennant, comprehended the three modern hundreds of Coleshill, Prestatyn, and Rhuddlan. The name is retained in the Mynydd Tegang of the district.

This battle took place in the year 880, three years after the death of Rhodri Mawr, and was called by Anarawd Dial Rhodri, or Rhodri's Revenge—the Welsh word *dial* meaning revenge. Some historians contend that this war is not historical, that it was the manufacture of a subsequent time. It is certainly difficult to reconcile the names of the narrative with a true chronology. There may thus be some confusion in the story, and yet the substance may be true. The sons of Rhodri Mawr were six, but we have an account only of three—those who succeeded their father in the three principalities already described. The tradition of the time—the end of the ninth century—represents the government of South Wales, or Dyfed, by these princes as tyrannical. The people of Dyfed sought from Alfred the Great, whose supremacy was in some sense acknowledged, protection against the sons of Rhodri and also against the Mercians. There is much confusion in the history of these times. In the early part of the tenth century there was much confusion. Danes and English seem mixed up in incursions and battles. In the year 903, or thereabouts, Merfyn was slain by the pagan Danes, or, according to another account, by his own men. The kingdom of Powys was now seized by Cadell, the king of South Wales, against the arrangements of the father Rhodri Mawr. In the year 906 an invasion of Caredigion, or Cardiganshire, by some marauders, apparently Danes, took place. A battle ensued at Dimirth, and Maelog, the lame son of Peredwr, fell, and St. David's was destroyed. In the year 908 the Saxon Chronicle relates that the city of Chester was placed in a condition for defence against the Danes and the Welsh. In the year 909 Cadell, the king of South Wales and Powys, died. In the year 915 Anarawd, the king of Gwynedd, died. Thus all the reigning sons of Rhodri Mawr had

passed away. The immediate successor of Anarawd on the throne of Gwynedd was his eldest son, Idwal Voel. He reigned for several years, and after his death the succession of his son was passed over and Howel Dda, or Howel the Good, became king of Gwynedd. The year in which this took place is uncertain. By this arrangement Howel Dda became the king of all Wales, and the division of the country into three independent or semi-independent principalities made by his grandfather, Rhodri Mawr, was reversed, and the union of the three into one kingdom under one sovereign was effected.

Howel Dda became a great king, and secured much prosperity for his kingdom, and because of his many good qualities he received afterwards the designation of the Good—Howel the Good. The reign of Howel corresponded with that of Edward the Elder in England (901–925), that of Athelstan (925–940), and that of Edmund (940–946), and into that of Edred (947). The relation of Howel to the kings of England was friendly. In the year 926 Howel met the king of the Scots, Constantine, Owen, the British king of Gwent, Ealdred, son of Ealdulf of Bamborough, and Athelstan, king of England, at a place called Eamot, and confirmed peace with oaths and pledges. In 928 he, it is said, went the then fashionable pilgrimages. Afterwards he attended some of the Witenagemotes held by Athelstan, for we find his name subscribed to certain charters and documents as one of the witnesses. Thus he went in 931 to Lawton, and his attestation is thus preserved: "Ego Howael subregulus consensi et subscripsi." He appears to have attended another Witenagemote in the same year, and also one in 932. "In 934 we find that he was at Winchester and at Frome. In 938 he was with three other Welsh kings at Dorchester. Nothing seems known of any transactions between Howel and Edmund, who succeeded Athelstan in 941; but he took part in the proclamation of Edred in 946, for both Howel and Morcant (we presume Morgan) attest a grant, seemingly one of a number of coronation grants that have survived to our time. And once more, in 949, Howel's name is found subscribed to a charter of the same king. In 950, according to an entry in the Annales Cambriæ, he died. According to the Brut y Tywyssogion he died in 948, but the grant of 949 seems in this instance to show that the Annales Cambriæ are more correct" (Blue Book, 1896). According to the same authority, the Book of Llandaff records an incident, but not free from doubt: Edgar was king of England, and Howel and Morgan Hen were subject to him; Morgan was king of Glamorgan, and there was a dispute between him and Howel; the latter claimed those portions of Glamorgan called Ystrdyw and Ewyas; the English king summoned his under-kings and Morgan's son Owain before him, and after examination decided in favour of Morgan. There are chronological difficulties connected with this incident. Edgar was not king of England till 958 or 959, about ten years after the death of Howel.

It seems evident from the preceding that even Howel Dda acknowledged the supremacy of the English king. The attestation of Howel at Lawton in the year 931, "Ego Howael subregulus," indicates that he recognised the supremacy of Athelstan. This did not imply that the kingdom of Wales was dependent. The supremacy was a nominal one. The other kings, princes, and chiefs in Wales were subject to Howel. He did not supersede the minor kings and rulers, but made them subject and subordinate to his over-kingship. Such was the position of Wales in the tenth century. After Howel there was much confusion in the government of the country. The unity of the kingdom was broken up, and small wars promoted by rival princes prevailed through the country.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE ANCIENT LAWS AND INSTITUTES OF WALES

In the tenth century the most wonderful production of Welsh literature and legislation made its appearance. This was the book which bears the name of "The Ancient Laws and Institutes of Wales." For this production the Welsh were indebted to their great monarch, Howel Dda, or Howel the Good, who died in the year 950. For many ages the work existed only in very ancient MSS. The oldest of these MSS. in Welsh dates from the twelfth century. It is called the Black Book of Chirk, and is the foundation of the Venedotian Code of Laws. The Ancient Laws exist in three classes; namely, the Venedotian, which was the code for Gwynedd and Powys; the Dimetian, which belonged to the kingdom of Dyfed or Dimetia or South Wales; and the Gwentian, which belonged to that part of South Wales called Gwent, east of Glamorgan. In former times the discrepancies observed in the MSS. were a source of perplexity, but Aneurin Owen made the discovery that they really belonged to three classes corresponding with the three codes: the Venedotian, the Dimetian, and the Gwentian. These three codes are substantially the same, but were modified to suit the three different peoples for whom they were intended.

These Ancient Laws were first printed in the year 1730, under the editorship of Dr. Wotton, assisted by Messrs. Moses Williams and Clarke, under the designation of *The Leges Wallicæ*. A portion of the Laws was subsequently printed in the Cambrian Register, and, in the year 1807, in the third volume of that remarkable Welsh book called "The Myvyrian Archaiology," edited by Owen Jones (Myfyr), Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg) and William Owen Pugh (Idrison). An edition of this important work in one volume was published by Gee of Denbigh in the year 1870, and is now before us. It contains the writings of the ancient bards, a collection of historical documents, including the Triads, the Laws of Howel Dda according to the Venedotian Code are given, and an English translation. To the English reader the defect of this important book is the language. The only translation is the portion mentioned—the Venedotian Code of Laws.

The best edition of "The Ancient Laws of Wales" is that

published in the year 1841 by the Record Commissioners, and edited by Aneurin Owen, which is now before us. These Laws are given in the Welsh of the MSS. and translated into English. The history of this most important edition is as follows :—In the year 1822 an address by the House of Commons to King George IV. was presented, praying "that His Majesty would be graciously pleased to give such directions as His wisdom might think fit for a publication of a complete edition of the Ancient Historians of the realm." The result was that the commissioners of Public Records appointed Humphrey Parry, Esq., to prepare for publication such documents as related solely to Wales. The editor died before making any progress in the work, and the task was then given to Aneurin Owen, who accomplished the task in an able manner and published the work in 1841.

The composition of this book in the tenth century under the king, Howel Dda, is thus described. He perceived that the laws and customs of the country were violated with impunity and were falling into desuetude, and he caused them to be examined so as to make them suitable to the country. He summoned the archbishop of Menevia, other bishops, and the chief clergy, and six persons (four laymen and two of the clergy) from each commot, to meet at a place called in Welsh Y Ty Gwyn ar Dav, or, in English, The White House on the river Tav. The situation was near the site of the ancient Whitland Abbey, in Cærmarthenshire. It was called the White House because it was constructed of white rods. It was also a hunting-lodge of Howel. The number assembled consisted of 170 prelates and 836 deputies from the commots. Bishops in those days were numerous and were not diocesan, except a few. The superintendents of monasteries and other establishments then bore the name. The king himself was present, and under his direction, after prayer and fasting, twelve of the most experienced persons and a doctor of laws were selected from the whole assembly, to whom was assigned the task of examining, retaining, expounding, and abrogating the laws. The compilation resulting from their labours was read through, allowed, and proclaimed. The king caused three copies to be written : one was to accompany the court for daily use, another was to be deposited in the court at Aberfraw, in Anglesey, where the royal residence was ; and the third at Dinevwr, in South Wales. The usual residence of the king of Gwynedd was at Aberfraw, which is now a village in Anglesey. The usual royal residence for South Wales was at Dinevwr, near Llandilo Vawr in the Vale of Tywi. The code of laws intended for that portion of South Wales then designated Gwent contained the same explanations of the origin of the codes, but there were made modifications to suit the different circumstances and customs of the people. This large district of Gwent was in ancient times inhabited by the tribes called the Silures, considered to be a non-Aryan race. It was coincident with the diocese of Llandaff.

The three codes were essentially the same, but with modifications

adapted to the customs of the different peoples. In the course of time some alterations were made in the codes. For instance, about the year 1080 Bleddyn the king made considerable alterations in the Venedotian Code ; and shortly afterwards Gruffydd ab Cynan "reformed the canons which regulated the bards and the minstrels." Owen Gwynedd, his son, who succeeded to the throne about the year 1137, admitted the consecration of the bishop of St. Asaph by the archbishop of Canterbury. Some changes were also made in the codes for South Wales. These minor alterations were to be expected, but they left the codes substantially unchanged. Differences of reading there are as well as these minor alterations, and yet we now possess the codes in substance the same as Howel Dda had them prepared in the tenth century.

The time when the great congress of Welshmen met at the White House by command of Howel Dda to frame these codes of laws has been disputed. Some, as Camden and William Salisbury, supposed it to be the year 914 ; Spelman preferred 940 ; Taylor 942 ; Dr. Clarke 943. This is the mean and the probable date according to Aneurin Owen. Howel died in the year 948, or more probably in 950, and there is a great probability that the work was completed a few years before his death. He began to reign in the year 910 in South Wales, but he did not become king of all Wales until the death of his nephew, Idwal of Gwynedd, who died about 940 or 943. In the preface to the three codes Howel is called the prince of (all) Cymru or Wales.

The language of the codes is that of the time when they were framed, or rather when the ancient MSS. were written, and the old spelling is retained in the Welsh printing. The codes are in this edition translated into English, and are thus open to the perusal and the study of Englishmen. The knowledge is thus no longer confined to Welsh scholars. For many ages the ancient literature of the Britons was neglected or ignored by most Welshmen and by all England. It was fortunately preserved by a few Welsh gentlemen in their private libraries, and thus escaped destruction. In the library of the Vaughan family at Hengwrt, in Merionethshire, were preserved many most important MSS. They are now in the house of Mr. Wynne, Peniarth. The ancient family of Wynne preserved at Wynnstay very ancient and valuable MSS. There are valuable MSS. in the British Museum and in the libraries of the University of Oxford. The MS. marked A., the basis of the Venedotian Code of Laws, dates from the twelfth century ; that marked B. is a little later than A., but was written probably at the end of the twelfth century ; MS. C. is referred to the thirteenth century ; and D. dates from the fourteenth century. There are hundreds of MSS. thus preserved, and they make up the ancient literature of the Cymry, and from these the printed copies of the Ancient Laws, the poetry of the bards, and the historical documents, including the Triads, have been derived. The resolution of Parliament, in 1822, to have these MSS. examined and printed in English, as well as in Welsh, was the first and the most important

step taken by the state to open up this ancient and most valuable literature to the perusal and the study of Englishmen.

It is impossible to give, within our restricted limits, a complete analysis of the Laws of Howel and the other works referred to. We can give only a mere outline, and confine ourselves here to the Venedotian Code—the one intended for Gwynedd and Powys. The preface gives the reason for the calling of the assembly, and designates Howel the Good "prince of all Cymru." The Laws are divided into three parts, and are in this work placed under three books. The first book contains the Laws that were to govern the court. There were to be twenty-four officers connected with the court: sixteen for the king's department and eight for the queen's. The king's officers were: 1. Chief of the household; 2. Priest of the household; 3. Steward; 4. Chief falconer; 5. Judge of the court; 6. Chief groom; 7. Page of the chamber; 8. Bard of the household; 9. Silentiary; 10. Chief huntsman; 11. Mead brewer; 12. Mediciner; 13. Butler; 14. Door-ward; 15. Cook; 16. Candle-bearer. The officers of the queen were: 1. Steward to the queen; 2. Priest to the queen; 3. Chief groom to the queen; 4. Page of the chamber to the queen; 5. Handmaid to the queen; 6. Door-ward to the queen; 7. Cook to the queen; 8. Candle-bearer to the queen. The officers of the king sit above those of the queen at the table. The salaries of these officers were paid in a manner peculiar to the age. Three times a year they were entitled to receive their woollen garments from the king and their linen garments from the queen—at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The king was to give the queen a third of the produce of his landed property; and the servants of the king were to give, in like manner, a third to the servants of the queen. The king was to have in attendance on him thirty-six horsemen—namely, the twenty-four officers and the twelve gwastas or guests, the men who brought the entertainment dues from each maenol or manor from the lord. The heir-apparent or edling must be the son or nephew of the king, and he must be the most honourable in the palace after the king and queen. Then the code describes his position at the table, the youth in attendance upon him, and his allowance, etc. Then is described the positions at the table of the several officers. The priest was to sit next to the second screen, and he was to bless the food and chant the Pater. The bard of the household was to sit on one hand of the chief of the household. Then is described minutely the qualifications and functions of the various officers.

We cannot give even a condensed account of the duties, privileges, positions, and pay of all the twenty-four officers, but one or two may be referred to. The bard of the court was to have his land free, a horse in attendance, his clothes from the king and the queen; he was to sit next to the chief of the household at the three principal festivals; he was to sing when desired and play on the harp. The first song was to be of God, the second of the king. When desired he was to go and sing in a low voice to the

queen. He was to share the spoil of war and sing the "Monarchy of Britain" to them. He was to lodge with the chief of the household. The mediciner of the royal household was to have his land free, his horse, his clothing, a seat in the palace, and his lodging with the chief of the household. He was to administer medicine gratuitously to all in the palace except for their dangerous wounds; for the treatment of these he was to have nine score pence and his food, or one pound without his food. His fee for letting blood was fourpence; the value of his food was worth one penny halfpenny. He was never to leave the palace without permission of the king. The priest of the queen was to have his land free, a horse, and clothing; he was to have the clothes in which the queen did penance during Lent, and he was to have his lodging with the king's priest in the house of the chaplain. He was to bless the meat and the drink brought into the chamber, or, as we say, say grace before and after the meal. Probably in those days as well as in more modern times the *grace* uttered was regarded not merely as the expression of thanks to the bountiful Creator and Giver of the food, but as making some beneficial change in the food itself.

In connection with the duties and privileges of the various officers much was said about the worth and the saraad of each in accordance with the customs of the age and the country. The term *saraad* signified primarily disgrace, and then the fine or penalty for the insult to or crime committed against a person. The injury inflicted upon a person was estimated at so much money or property. The amount of the fine was regulated in the ancient laws by the magnitude of the injury and the position of the sufferer. The amount of the fine was the saraad of the sufferer.

The second book in this code treats of the Laws of the country. We can only indicate the character of the contents and a few peculiarities. The first law relates to woman. If a woman be given in marriage, she is to abide by her "agweddi" or dower unto the end of the seventh year, and if there be three nights wanting of the seventh year and they separate, they were to divide them into two equal portions. Of the children, two shares to the father, the oldest and the youngest, and one share to the mother; the middlemost to the mother. Rules are given for the minute division among them of the property, the clothes, and the furniture. From the enumeration of the articles of furniture given it is evident that the Britons of the tenth century lived in the enjoyment of many domestic comforts. Their debts were also to be equally divided, but the woman's dowry and other things were to be repaid to her. This kind of separation did not apparently amount to divorce, for it is enacted that if the husband take another wife after the separation, the first wife was free. And if the separated woman take another husband, the man would be free. This would be on both sides equivalent to a divorce. The separations and the divorces seemed easily effected in those

ancient days, and the standard of morality was not high, but no man was allowed to have two wives. The rights of the woman are minutely defined in this code, whether married or single, but these were estimated on a property basis. Wrongs were punished by fines paid to the woman wronged. A woman was *given* in marriage and a dowry was bestowed. From this ancient custom has probably descended the modern form of some one *giving the woman away* in marriage. The consent of the lord to the marriage was necessary, and this was given in the court. The marriage was publicly recorded and was not complete until the *amobyr* or marriage fee was paid to the lord. In addition to this regular marriage, there were clandestine, or private marriages, where the bride gave herself away with or without witnesses. It was an inferior kind of marriage, but subject to certain conditions, and may become legitimate. There were some customs that would now be deemed extraordinary. If husbands remained away in war for three years, their wives were allowed to sleep with their bond servants.

Then follow many minute laws of the country which we cannot fully describe. There are regulations pertaining to a person who has done wrong outside the sanctuary with or without the possessions of relics, indicating the existence of the superstition attached to the old bones of supposed saints. The laws pertaining to landed property are minute, and the form of pleading in the court is clearly described. When assembled in the royal court, the position of the officers and the persons concerned is described thus : The king sits with his officers around him ; on one side and the other there sat an elder and a sword ; then on one side sat the judge of the commot, or lower court, and a priest ; on the corresponding position on the other side was the judge of the court and a priest ; lower down on the other side was the guider, pleader, defendant, and on the other side the pleader, plaintiff, guider. At the bottom on each side was the apparitor. In this form the court sat and conducted the trial in due legal order.

The laws for the division of land among brothers are laid down. The brothers were to have the property divided equally among them, four *erws* to every tenement, afterwards altered by the king Bleddyn, who followed Howell (1060–1073). There is some doubt as to the quantity of land denoted by the term erw. It was either 1,440 square yards, or 4,320, according to the method of calculation. There was a strange law concerning the property of a bishop, thus expressed : "When the bishop dies, all his property belongs to the king ; for every property without an owner is waif to the king, except vestments and ornaments of the Church and what shall pertain to it." The meaning, no doubt, was that the king was the legal owner until a new bishop was appointed. The union of Church and State was then very close. The laws of inheritance pertaining to males and females were somewhat complicated. "According to the men of Gwynedd a woman is not to have patrimony, because two rights are not to centre in the

same person—those are the patrimony of the husband and her own." The law in the Dimetian Code is altered. The rights of women were considerable under these codes, but the two sexes were not equal in regard to property.

In the Venedotian Code there is a strange reference (p. 185) to the mythical king of Britain in prehistoric times. "Before this, and before the crown of London, and the supremacy of this island, were seized by the Saxons, Dyvnwal Moelmud, son of Clydno, was king over this island, who was son to the earl of Cernyw (or Cornwall) by a daughter of the king of Lloegyr (or England)." To this ancient king is here attributed the first establishment of "good laws in this island ; and those laws continued in force until the time of Howel the Good, son of Cadell." The ancient Britons, as here recognised, ascribed their primitive laws and institutions to Dyvnwal, but this rests on mere tradition relating to prehistoric times and is generally regarded as mythical.

The third portion of this Venedotian Code, called here Book Third, is designated Proof Book, and treats of the functions of a judge and the accessories of various crimes, and the worth of different kinds of properties—animals, articles, trees, buildings, furniture, etc. Of the judge, it is laid down that he must understand the law as contained in this Book of Laws, that when his teacher shall find him competent, he must be examined by the judge of the court and tested, and if found competent, the judge must recommend him to the lord, and then the lord will invest him with judicial functions, and then his decisions are to be of authority. He was to pay the judge of the court a fee of twenty-four pence. He was required to be just and free from corruption, and should he pronounce an unjust sentence, he was not entitled to his tongue unless he redeem it for its worth in law. The importance of honest judges was thus recognised in those ancient times.

The word *galanas* denotes the crime of murder, and this code points out nine accessories to the crime : To point out the person to be murdered, to counsel the deed, to consent to it, to be a spy and association with the murderer are accessories. The saraad, or penalty, for the crime was a fine estimated according to the importance of the murdered person and payable by the murderer and his relatives, or the lord. The application of the penalty, the amount, and the distribution of the fine are minutely and elaborately described in these laws.

Then follows the nine accessories of theft and fire, and after these there is described the worth of different properties as the basis of the apportionment of the fines or penalties. This subject is gone into very minutely, tedious to read, but necessary as a code of laws in the age that framed them.

The other codes are similar to the Venedotian just described, with some modifications adapted to Dimetia and Gwent. The codes as prepared under Howel Dda were to some extent changed or modified after his time. In the Venedotian Code there are allusions to the alterations made by Bleddyn, the prince or king

of North Wales, which were effected about the year 1080, about 150 years after Howel Dda (p. 167). There are other indications, pointed out by Aneurin Owen, that alterations in the code were made by revisers in the course of time. In the Dimetian Code alterations were made by Rhys. son of Gruffydd, prince of South Wales, about the year 1180. Such alterations were found necessary and were made by authority. The basis remained the same as framed by Howel Dda. This may be taken as an illustration of changes effected in other ancient books, such, for instance, as the Five Books of Moses, the substance remaining the same.

When the codes were completed, they were sanctioned by the king and by the entire assembly. The king with three bishops and others visited the pope at Rome, probably in the year 928, and obtained from the pope his sanction to these laws. There has been some doubt on the subject, but the tradition is probably true.

The perusal of these codes is tedious to us in these days, accustomed to a different order of things, but the contents are very instructive as indications of the social, religious, and political life of the times. The position of the priest in the court and in the affairs of the State shows that the Church had much power and that the superstition of the times prevailed among the ancient Britons as among other peoples. The union of Church and State was then very intimate. Indeed, the distinction between the provinces of the State and the Church, which we now finely draw, hardly existed in those days. The two were then mixed up as parts of the one complex state. The position of the bards in the same court shows that they were then recognised as a distinct order ; they had been so regarded for many ages and continued long afterwards. The bardic order, which in modern times is honoured at the Eisteddfod, is one of the oldest institutions of the Welsh people. The poetic spirit belongs to the Celtic race, and the bards were the prophets of this spirit.

In the ancient times now under review, the British kings were not absolute monarchs in the true sense. They were subject to law as well as their people. Constitutional government in the modern sense of the word was not known among the Britons a thousand years ago, but the essential spirit of it was recognised when those old kings consulted the wishes of their subjects in the establishment of institutions social and political. When Howel Dda desired to form a permanent code of laws for the entire country, he did not presume to do it by his own arbitrary will, but summoned a body of men representative of every part of the country in Church and State. The large assembly, or congress, which was summoned to the White House in Caermarthenshire to deliberate on the code of laws and to determine the same, represented every commot, or township in the country, and also the Church. The principle of representation was thus distinctly recognised in legislation, the most important function in the State.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ANCIENT BRITONS DURING THE CENTURY 950–1050

The lifetime of Howel Dda was perhaps the most important period in the history of Wales as a united kingdom. The people were brought to a condition of greater national unity than in many centuries before. There was one monarch or over-king, and under this one monarch an agreement was made to establish a uniform code of laws for the entire country, or at all events three codes which were substantially the same, differing only in a few modifications adapted to some local peculiarities. We must bear in mind that though the Welsh people in the nineteenth century appear to be a homogeneous race in nature and language, it was not so to the same extent a thousand or twelve hundred years ago. It has been shown in previous chapters that the Welsh people are derived from more races than one, and that the two great branches of the Celtic family—the Goidelic and the Brythonic—contributed to the amalgamated people. The ancient British states already described under the names Powys, Gwynedd, Dyved or Dimetia, and Gwent, were not arbitrary distinctions, but probably rested originally on some racial differences. The people of Powys represented the ancient Ordovices, or the later settlers of the Brythonic people, and were more purely of the Cymric branch of the Celts. The people of Gwent descended largely from the ancient Silures, a non-Aryan people, mixed with the earliest settlers of the Goidelic branch, formerly called the Gadhelic. The inhabitants of Dimetia, or most of South Wales, are regarded by modern scholars as largely the descendants of the ancient Goidels. The people of Gwynedd, which embraced a considerable part of North Wales, were a mixture of the two Celtic branches, and at one time the Goidels predominated. These geographical and racial differences were doubtless a source of disunion among the ancient Britons. They were also the cause of different dialects of the one Celtic speech spoken in these provinces. There are now even in the nineteenth century differences in the speech of Welshmen north and south amounting to different dialects. Professor Rhys observes in his "Celtic Britain," p. 275, that there are actually four chief dialects spoken in Wales, and that they are those of the four provinces or ancient British states previously described. These linguistic differ-

ences now observable in the speech of Wales north and south have descended from the ancient British peoples of those districts.

The existence of these differences in olden times was one of the causes that rendered the union of the country difficult. The unity of the people was realised in the reign of Howel Dda more than previously, and this showed the greatness of his character and his moral influence. The unity thus secured by Howel was interrupted by his death in 950. The whole of Wales was united under Howel, but the nature of the union was such that it was easily disturbed. The country united under him consisted of three or four separate states formerly independent or semi-independent. They were Dimetia, Powys, Gwynedd, and perhaps Gwent. During the union under Rhodri the Great and Howel Dda, no fusion of the population took place. The government was centred in one man, and codes of laws substantially the same were agreed upon; but they remained in spirit and form different principalities. The sons or descendants of former kings had not surrendered their regal rights, and only waited for an opportunity to assert them. This occurred on the death of Howel. The condition of the governments of Wales is thus fairly described in the Blue Book on the Land Question in Wales (1896): "The form of government, so far as the term 'government' can be used at all, was monarchical. In theory, the king of Gwynedd or Aberffraw was head of the organisation. He himself recognised the over-lordship of the king of England. Regularly all other chieftains, rulers, princes, or kings in Cymru were subject to the lord of Aberffraw. The result is that there was a more or less well-understood hierarchy of lords or princes, which presents remarkable analogies to a feudal kingdom. In the Chronicles sometimes one individual is represented as king over the whole of Wales. We have seen that Howel the Good is an instance in point. At other times there were several kings or princes who are represented as exercising power in different districts of the territory, and enjoying various regal privileges and prerogatives. There does not appear to have been any alteration in theory caused by the subdivision of the territory of the Cymry. What is really meant by saying that Howel the Good was lord of all Wales is that certain districts, usually held by subordinate lords or princes, were possessed directly by Howel, who received the dues and enjoyed the privileges ordinarily received and enjoyed by the latter. That is, it really amounted to Howel's taking possession of all the rights and privileges of the king of Powys and the king of Gwynedd, as well as those of the king of South Wales. The kingship of Powys and the kingship of Gwynedd were assumed to continue to exist, though the kingship was in the hand of one man. . . . Whatever the theory, the state of the country was as a rule very unsettled, and sometimes anarchical" (p. 117).

The death of Howel was followed by internal strife. The sons of Idwal, who had been king of Gwynedd before Howel assumed the supremacy of Wales, came forward to claim the kingship of

Gwynedd. A war commenced even in the year when Howel died between the children of Idwal and those of Howel. The sons of Idwal were Iago and Ienan, and they carried on a war in Dyved or South Wales, and twice ravaged the country. Two of the sons of Howel died soon after their father, probably in the year 952. Their names were Dyvnwal and Rhodri. The surviving brothers continued the war. A battle took place in 953 at Llanrwst in Carnarvonshire. The sons of Idwal were victorious, and they followed up their victory by invading and devastating Caredigion or Cardiganshire, in the kingdom of Dyved or South Wales. The war continued for several years, and was brought to an end about the year 959, when Iago and Ienan, sons of Idwal, were victorious, and were recognised as kings of Wales—probably of Gwynedd and Powys, and over-kings of Wales. A third son of Howel died during the struggle, but Owain, another son, survived, and became king of South Wales. The civil war was thus ended ; and though the unity of the governing power was nominally retained in the sons of Idwal, the kingdoms appear to have returned really to the condition they were in before the time of Howel Dda.

A story has been told in the Annals that Owain, king of South Wales, son of Howel, invaded the kingdom of Glamorgan in support of some feudal claim on two districts in that principality, over which Morgan Hen was prince or king. The date is assigned to the year 958. The same story has been related of Howel Dda, the father of Owain, and that the dispute was referred to King Edgar of England, whose supremacy was acknowledged on both sides. In a previous chapter this matter has been referred to. The district disputed consisted of two commots named Ystradyw and Ewyas. King Edgar decided in favour of Morgan Hen. The two accounts and the dates are in confusion. Edgar became king of England in 958, and sole monarch some year or two afterwards. Howel Dda died in 950. The opinion of critics is that the substance of the story is true, but the dates and the names are mixed up in confusion, which we will not venture to explain. It is probable that Edgar was the king who acted as arbitrator, as his paramount authority seems to have been acknowledged by the Welsh princes. Morgan Hen was a man of importance as prince of Morganwg, and at a time not distant from the date mentioned, he was said to have restored certain lands to the see of Llandaff at the order of King Edgar. These two men died nearly the same time, Edgar in 975 and Morgan Hen in 974, though some extend his life much farther. After the death of this distinguished man, whose full name was Morgan ab Owain ab Hywel ab Rhys, there was in 983 an election of Kings of Morganwg, and several names are mentioned, of whom four were sons of Morgan and two of Elised. The narrative is not very clear.

The kingdom of Gwynedd, as previously stated, was governed by the joint kings, brothers and sons of Idwal, namely, Iago and Ienan. The country was not free from disturbances caused by foreign intruders. In the year 963 an invasion of the Danes, then

called the Pagans, took place, and five years later the kingdom of Aberfraw was devastated, and Rhodri, son of Idwal, was slain. This invasion was ascribed by some chroniclers to the Irish ; probably they were the Danes from Ireland. The two brothers, Iago and Ienan, sons of Idwal, who by agreement became joint kings of Gwynedd after the death of Howel, did not agree, as might have been expected. Two kings on one throne would need perfection in thought and feeling to secure unanimity in the government of a kingdom for the welfare of the people. These men were not anything like perfection. The result was that they quarrelled. Iago is represented as the cause of blindness to his brother Ienan, whom he imprisoned and subsequently hanged. Another account is that the son of Ienan rescued his father from prison, and then in 974 expelled his uncle Iago, and himself ascended the throne. The name of this son was Howel Drwg, or Howel the Bad. He reigned until the year 989, when he died. This assumption of royal power by Howel Drwg was not without a struggle. In the year 979 a place called Cyveiliog, and another called Lleyn, were ravaged by the troops of Howel, aided, it was said, by the Saxons. This indicates that the inhabitants of the country did not willingly submit to the new king. In the year 980 Iago was entirely overcome, and became the prisoner of his nephew. He was treated generously and allowed to spend the remainder of his life as a subordinate king of some portion of Gwynedd. According to some accounts he was made prisoner by the Danes, who then attacked Chester by their fleets.

Howel, son of Ienan, became king of North Wales or Gwynedd, and reigned until his death in 989. His reign was not without opposition in that age of unrest and war. The son of Iago, whose name was Cystennyn Ddu or Constantine the Black, united with some Danes under the command of Godfrey, the son of the Danish sea-king Harold, and made an attack upon Anglesey. The invaders, however, were defeated in a battle at Hirbarth, and Cystennyn was slain, it was said by the hand of Howel himself. After the death of Howel Drwg, the kingdom of Gwynedd was in great confusion owing to the number of claimants to the throne—a common source of discord and internal war among the ancient Britons. There were several sons of Meirig, the son of Idwal Voel, among the claimants, one of whom, Ionaval, was killed by Cadwallown, the brother of the late king Howel. This prince now managed to secure the throne in succession to his brother Howel, but retained it only for a short time. A prince named Meredydd ab Owain came forward and opposed him by arms and defeated and slew him in battle at the close of the year 987, or thereabouts, for dates are not certain. Meredydd became the king of Gwynedd after a successful war, in which he exhibited "craft and cunning," or perhaps much military skill. Many deaths of princes took place either in war or by treachery, including one of Meredydd's brothers, and another brother, Llywarch, in all probability to remove all formidable opponents to his throne. The Danes,

however, again invaded Anglesey under Godfrey, the son of Harold. In the war that followed two thousand British prisoners were taken and Meredydd was defeated. He then retired from Gwynedd and occupied Caredigion and Dyfed. In the meantime (988) Owain, king of South Wales, son of Howel Dda, died, and this enabled Meredydd to resume his supremacy in Gwynedd. The peace did not continue long, for the sons of Meirig rose, and in a battle at Llanwn in Denbighshire Meredydd was defeated. Idwal, the son of Meirig, now became king of Gwynedd in the year 995, but in the second year afterwards he was killed. Such was the condition of North Wales at the close of the tenth century: an illustration of the results of internal discords and family quarrels.

After the death of Owain in 988, his son, Meredydd, succeeded him on the throne of South Wales, and this enabled him to regain the supremacy in Gwynedd or North Wales. Meredydd died in the year 999. He left a daughter of the name of Angharad, who married as her first husband Llewelyn, who through her influence became king of Gwynedd and reigned from 1010 to the year 1023. Afterwards their son Gruffydd ab Llewelyn succeeded, after an interval, in 1039, and reigned until the year 1063. Then from 1069 to 1075 the son of Angharad by her second husband was king. His name was Bleddyn. At the same time he was king of Powys.

During the events that occurred in the kingdom of Gwynedd as narrated above, the kingdom of South Wales was also in a condition of disturbance and suffered many evils. The Danes, under Godfrey, after ravaging Anglesey, attacked South Wales. The country of Dyfed and St. David were harassed by them and great injury was inflicted. A battle was fought in Cardiganshire on the river Teivi at a place called Llanwenawg. The Saxons also invaded South Wales, and much evil was wrought to Brycheiniog, our Breconshire, and to all the territory of Einion ab Owen. There were often quarrels between the kings of South Wales and the princes of Morganwg. There were also dissensions among the princes of Morganwg, the descendants of Morgan Hen. The history of the Britons of the kingdoms of Wales in this period is very complicated, and the names and dates are uncertain. There were wars among themselves, between kings and princes contending for power in Gwynedd, South Wales, and Morganwg; sometimes one prince prevailed and then another. The Danes invaded Anglesey and also South Wales and ravaged the country in the fashion of the times. They did not, however, remain, but retired after a temporary occupation. The Saxons also invaded South Wales, and battles and slaughter were the consequence. There was, however, no material change in the relation of Wales to England, notwithstanding the invasion of Wales and the defeat of the Welsh by Harold II. in the year 1064, before he became king. The dyke constructed by Offa in the eighth century remained practically the boundary of Wales.

CHAPTER XXV

THE ANCIENT BRITONS AND THE NORMANS

The conquest of England by the Normans under their duke William of Normandy was the beginning of a new era in the history of England and in that of the Britons.

Edward the Confessor was king from 1042 to January 5, 1066. He was the son of Ethelred, and had spent much of his time in exile at the court of Normandy during the supremacy of the Danes. He was regarded as a good man, of mild and gentle disposition, and because of his holiness he was called the "Confessor." We must judge of these things by the character of the age. A pious man in those days was one that favoured the Church, that reverenced the supposed relics of saints, and indulged in superstitious ceremonies. Edward was a man of feebleness as a king. During a portion of his reign the work of government was done mostly by the celebrated Godwin, the earl of Wessex, whose daughter Editha, or Edith, the king married. The most active and warlike during this period was Harold, the second son of Godwin, who became king after the death of Edward the Confessor. For twelve years in the reign of Edward Harold was the chief military leader in the kingdom. Godwin, the great earl of Wessex, died suddenly when he was on a visit to the king at Winchester, not long after his return from banishment. He was taken ill at the dinner-table of the king on Monday, April 12, 1053, and died on the following Thursday. His son Harold was made earl of Wessex in the place of his father. In the year 1063 Harold conducted a campaign against the Welsh. Gruffydd ab Llewelyn reigned as king of Gwynedd from 1039 to 1063. In the year 1050 Gruffydd, assisted by marauders from Ireland, crossed the river Wye into Mercia and defeated an English force gathered and commanded by the bishop of Worcester, Eldred. In the following year, 1051, Gruffydd defeated and almost destroyed another force which proceeded against him from the castle of Leominster. After this, about three years later or about the year 1054, Gruffydd allied himself with Ælfgar, the son of Leofric, the earl of Mercia. Ælfgar was then an outlaw and had collected a piratical force in Ireland. Thus assisted they marched into Herefordshire and defeated the English forces under Rudulf, the Norman earl of the west country. The English fled, and Gruffydd and Ælfgar entered the city of Hereford and burnt it and the

cathedral. This was the barbarous method of warfare in those days. The Welsh troops, with much booty and many prisoners, then retired into Wales.

The aggressions of the Welsh described led the king of England, Edward the Confessor, to organise a powerful army under the command of Harold and attack the Welsh in their own country. In the year 1063 Harold invaded Wales and penetrated into the mountainous region of Snowdon. The Welsh were defeated, and the king, Gruffydd, escaped to South Wales. The Welsh submitted and peace was made and Harold retired by way of South Wales, whence he proceeded by sea and became a prisoner in France. Shortly after the defeat of the Welsh the king of Gwynedd was murdered by some of his own subjects. This Gruffydd was not merely king of Gwynedd, he was the over-king of all Wales. After his death his half-brothers became kings or sub-kings, namely, Bleddyn ab Rhiwallon, and Meredydd ab Owain was made king of South Wales. These remarks are preliminary to the history of the conquest of England by William of Normandy.

Edward the Confessor died January 5, 1066, leaving no children. Harold, the second son of Godwin, was appointed king of England and was crowned immediately—January 6th, the same day on which Edward was buried. The brother of Harold, Tostig, who had been earl of Northumbria and was banished from the kingdom for his conduct, prepared an expedition abroad and landed in the north to oppose Harold. He was joined by Harold Hardrada from Norway, who was the half-brother of Olaf, king of Norway. The English Harold advanced to the north to meet and conquer the invaders. The city of York welcomed him; he hastened to meet the foe, and at the battle of Stamford Bridge, a few miles from York, he completely defeated them. Before, however, he returned to London he received the tidings that William of Normandy had crossed the Channel with a large army and landed in England. This leads us to the great events which resulted in the conquest of England by William, which had important consequences to the future of the Welsh people.

The Normans were originally the Northmen who harassed the coasts of France and Britain. Under Rollo, who was expelled from Norway, a band of Norwegians at the close of the ninth century invaded the Orkney Islands and the Hebrides, and afterwards proceeded to the French coast, where they landed and succeeded in conquering the town of Rouen and the province of which it was the chief town. France was then a country of several states, kingdoms, and principalities, and internal discord prevailed. This was an advantage to Rollo, which he did not fail to use for his own purpose. After some years of warfare the French king made peace with Rollo in the year 912 and granted him the dignity of Duke of Normandy on condition that he acknowledged fealty to him and became a Christian. Thus the province of Neustria was turned into the dukedom of Normandy. The original band commanded

by Rollo were Norwegians, but in the course of their progress they were joined by a number of Danes, and the final success was gained by the united forces of Norwegians and Danes, who formed the permanent settlement in Normandy. We must not, however, suppose that the natives of Neustria were entirely displaced by the Northmen. We learn from history that, tired of continual war, they submitted to the power and government of the Northmen. They remained in their country and became the subjects, and some of them the serfs, of the conqueror. Rollo, when he first landed in Neustria, sailed up the Seine to Rouen in the year 876, and took the city, and maintained his position against the attacks of the duke of Orleans, whom he twice defeated. The ravages of these Northmen in France were so great that Charles the Simple, king of France, made peace with Rollo in the year 911 or 912, on the conditions mentioned above. The pirate duke was baptized by the archbishop of Rouen. Thus the ancient province of Neustria was ceded to the Northmen, and came to be known as Normandy under the government of a duke. Rollo lived to a good age, retired from his position in favour of his son William I. Longsword. The date of his death is uncertain, but he spent the last years of his life in peaceful retirement. William the Conqueror of England was the seventh duke of Normandy. The Normans who conquered and founded the dukedom were chiefly men, and when they settled in the country they allied themselves with native women. The next generation would be a mixed race. The conquerors of England in 1066 were thus a mixed people derived from Norwegians, Danes, and French. In Normandy they soon abandoned and forgot their own language and adopted the language, the manners, and the habits of the French. In 1066 they were truly Norman-Frenchmen, the French element preponderating.

The conquest of England by the Normans differed from preceding conquests. In the case of the Anglo-Saxons and the Danes the conquests were made subservient to colonisation and permanent settlements. The invaders sought a new home, and found it after prolonged warfare. The conquest of England by the Normans was purely military, and resulted in no important settlements. They became the ruling power—the government, the aristocracy, the landed proprietors, and the army—but not the great body of the population. The land was taken from the natives and distributed among the Norman soldiers and nobles. Every office of importance in Church and State was given to the conquerors, and the Anglo-Saxons were reduced to subjection and serfdom. The Normans, however, remained a small fraction of the population. The army brought over for conquest has been estimated at 60,000. Many of them were slain in successive battles, but others replaced them. A few families, besides the military, after the conquest was completed, did migrate to England from France and settled under the protection of the Norman power, but they were few compared with the entire population. Important and celebrated families were established

on large estates, but they did not displace to any great extent the native population.

According to Sir Edward Creasy, in his excellent book, "The Rise and Progress of the English Constitution" (p. 71), from 200,000 to 300,000 immigrants from Normandy and the continent generally became inhabitants of England during the reigns of William and his sons. The immigration continued during the reigns of Stephen and Henry II. The entire population of England at the Conquest has been estimated at from 1,500,000 to 2,500,000, or about 2,000,000. Probably 100,000 Normans finally remained, or about one in twenty of the population. For some time after the Conquest the Norman barons and important families looked upon Normandy as their home, and England as a province where they were to reside for a portion of their time. The loss of the French provinces by the weak and cruel government of King John changed this state of things. From that time, as Macaulay has shown, the barons made England their home, and a new beginning in the history of England may be dated.

The conquest of England by William of Normandy is pretty well known to all English readers of history. William claimed the throne of England on the ground that Edward the Confessor had bequeathed it to him, and that Harold himself had sworn over sacred relics to aid him in the fulfilment of the claim. In those days an oath over the old bones of a supposed saint was considered specially binding. Any pretence or excuse was regarded sufficient for a monarch who had determined to conquer the country by force. The Normans approached the country off the coast of Pevensey, and landed near on the 28th of September, when Harold was in the north. On hearing of his arrival the king hastened to London and put himself at the head of his troops, who put themselves in a position of defence at Senlac, now in memory of the conflict called *Battle*, a few miles from Hastings. Harold, knowing that his troops were fewer than the Normans and not in good discipline, intended to fight on the defensive, and if the troops had continued to do so the result would have been different. If the English had remained in their defensive position they might have succeeded; but they were tempted to pursue the retreating Normans, and left their strong position, and thereby lost their advantage and were defeated. The king and his brother were slain, and after a heroic defence the Saxons were defeated. This decisive battle took place on the 14th of October, 1066. The battle at Senlac, known in history as the battle of Hastings, was decisive, but the war continued for some time longer. The English royal family was nearly exterminated. There remained only Edgar the Atheling, son of Edmund Ironside, and he was only a boy. He was nominally chosen king, but in vain. William advanced towards London. Winchester was surrendered by the widow of Edward the Confessor, the daughter of Godwin. The pope had previously given his sanction to William, and now the bishops assembled

in London and submitted. The earls of Mercia and Northumbria —Edwin and Morcara—were the chief support of the fallen cause, but by the masterly movement of William, in crossing the Thames and threatening to cut them off from their earldoms, they were led to surrender. London gave way, and a deputation, headed even by Edgar, came and offered the crown to William. The country soon appeared to settle down in submission, and William left England for Normandy, placing his brother Odo, bishop of Bayeux, and William Fitz-Osbern, his minister, in charge of the government. During his absence the bishop governed tyranically, which led to a revolt. There was formed a league of western towns against the new government; a second revolt in the north broke out. The western rising, headed by Exeter, was soon put down by William, who had returned from Normandy. When hunting in the Forest of Dean he learnt that Northumbria had risen, and that the Norman garrison of York, to the number of 3,000, had been slaughtered. He marched to the north, and after some delay succeeded in subduing the country and extending his conquests to Scotland, and brought Malcolm the Scottish king to submit and to promise fealty to him. Amidst the many conflicts of the period there was one in the eastern counties of a severe nature. A remarkable patriot, called then *an outlaw*, placed himself at the head of a band who fought desperately, but ultimately perished, and the last hope of the English passed away when the town of Ely surrendered. The name of the hero was Hereward, "the last of the Saxons."

The preceding short sketch is preliminary to an account of the Norman relations to the Britons, or the Welsh. After the death of Gruffydd ab Llewelyn in 1063, king of Gwynedd and Wales generally, there was in North Wales civil war, arising from the dispute for the throne. By arrangement with Harold at the end of his Welsh campaign Bleddyn became king of Gwynedd and Powys, and, joined by Rhiwallon and Meredydd ab Owain, king of South Wales, agreed to be vassal of Edward the English king. The sons of Gruffydd ab Llewelyn, Meredydd, and Idwal, attempted to overturn the kings of Gwynedd and gain their father's throne. The attempt failed, but it led to much discord. Bleddyn continued to reign alone over Gwynedd and Powys from 1069 to 1075. This king Bleddyn is mentioned in the Venedotian Code of Laws as having made some alterations in the laws. The battle that decided the dispute was fought in Montgomeryshire, where Rhiwallon perished, and left Bleddyn as the sole monarch of Gwynedd and Powys. The two claimants to the throne also perished: Idwal in battle and Meredydd by cold and want when a wanderer among the mountains.

The Welsh took no part in the war against William, and were supposed to sympathise with his cause at first. They certainly had no love for the Saxons and none for Harold, who a few years previously had conducted successfully an expedition even into the mountainous region of Snowdon. They were, however, a

warlike race, and they soon took part on their borders and in the north against the Normans. The consequence was that after his northern campaign William marched to Wales and penetrated beyond its border into the interior, and commenced its gradual reduction by his system of building castles and settling barons along the frontier with authority to conquer the land of their respective districts. The progress, however, was not very great among the mountains of Wales. Green remarks: "In Wales William (Rufus) was less triumphant, and the terrible losses inflicted on the heavy Norman cavalry in the fastnesses of Snowdon forced him to fall back on the slower but wiser policy of the Conqueror." William the Conqueror effected the reduction of Chester, restored the walls, and erected there a castle, and subdued the inhabitants of the city and the neighbourhood, but the Welsh harassed the guard and the foreign baron in charge. The second earl of Chester was Hugh Lupus, called in Latin, *Hugo Comes Castriæ* ("Hugh, the count of Chester"). Tennant was of opinion that the Conqueror himself invested Lupus in the year 1069, for he was then in Chester repelling the Welsh and finally reducing Mercia. By means of the strong position of Chester, the Norman earl extended his earldom of Cheshire by conquering the district now known as Flintshire. The earldom of Chester was under Lupus made a *county palatine*, possessing such sovereign jurisdiction that the ancient earls had their own parliaments and courts of law, and in addition they were the sword-bearers of England at the times of the coronation.

Earl Lupus began his semi-regal reign by creating eight barons, who were to constitute his parliament. They were the barons of Halton, of Montalt, of Nantwich, of Shipbrook, of Malpas, of Massie, of Kinderton, and of Stockport. They were to assist the earl with their advice, attend upon him, repair to his court with dignity, and aid him in war. There were knights and freeholders who had to defend their own lands. Every baron had four esquires, every esquire had one gentleman, and every gentleman one valet. Each baron had a free court of pleas and suits. The earl of Chester was thus a small king under the supreme power of the king of England.

The method of conquest pursued by William and his successors, especially in Wales, was to erect strong castles in different places, put a baron in each and in possession of the land around, and by means of this strong position to acquire gradually more territory, and thus to extend the dominion of the English king. From Chester Castle the Norman earls gained Flintshire and erected other castles. Among these may be mentioned Holt, Hawarden, Rhuddlan, and others. In the kingdom of Powys the same process went on. A striking illustration is the castle of Montgomery, now in ruins. The town and castle were founded by Baldwyn, who was the lieutenant of William the Conqueror over the Marshes. The town was called by the Welsh after his name, Tre Faldwyn. The Welsh people, in their own language, still call it by the

same name. In the year 1092 Roger de Montgomery, earl of Shrewsbury, marched to Montgomery and captured the town and castle. This implied that the place was then in the occupation of the Welsh. He fortified the place, or perhaps enlarged and strengthened the fort constructed by Baldwyn, the basis of the real castle of the future. In the year 1094, however, the Welsh took the castle, destroyed the garrison, and ravaged the neighbouring country. The English king, William Rufus, collected an army and retook the town and castle. The earl of Shrewsbury reconstructed the castle. After some time it again fell into ruins until the year 1221, when Henry III. erected a new castle and granted it to his justiciary, Hubert de Burgh. During his time it was besieged by the Welsh, but relieved by the English. In the year 1231 Llewelyn the Great assembled an army which frightened Hubert so that he evacuated the castle, which was then occupied and burnt by the Welsh prince. The place underwent many fluctuations, destroyed and rebuilt. It remained until the civil war in the seventeenth century, when it was captured and finally destroyed by the Parliamentary forces in the year 1644. The history of the place is an illustration of the warfare of the times. From the castles the Normans issued forth and often ravaged the country, and the Welsh retaliated, and often conquered in battle and slaughtered their enemies. The country was gradually covered with castles large or small, the ruins of which are now to be seen. The castle of Rhuddlan, in North Wales, was a very old one. There was a great battle fought near between the Saxons and the Britons under Caradoc in the year 795. The Welsh tune called Morfa-Rhuddlan, of a plaintive character, is supposed to have been composed with a reference to this battle, in which the Welsh were defeated and many Britons were slain, including the king Caradoc. A portion of the castle was British, and supposed to have been constructed by Llewelyn ab Sitsylt, who reigned over Gwynedd from 1015 to 1020. In 1063 Harold, under the Confessor, captured the place and burnt the palace. It was, however, soon restored ; but a few years later Robert, a nephew of Hugh Lupus, captured it, and under the orders of William the Conqueror, strengthened and enlarged the fortifications, and afterwards made it his place of residence.

The erection of the frontier castles and placing garrisons in them by William the Conqueror became a source of constant irritation and war, and led ultimately to the entire conquest of the country by the English. The king of Gwynedd, or North Wales, about the time of the English conquest by William, was Bleddyn ab Cynvyn, who was regarded as a peaceful sovereign. He reigned over Gwynedd and Powys from 1060 to 1073, when he was murdered by Rhys ab Owain, who became the sovereign of South Wales along with Rhydderch ab Caradawg. The throne of Gwynedd was assumed by Trahaiarn ab Caradawg. The time was one of internal disorder and war. Another claimant to the

throne of Gwynedd appeared in the person of Gruffydd ab Cynan ab Iago. He had lived an exile in Ireland for some time, but now he crossed the channel supported by a force of mercenaries and landed in Anglesey and subdued it. Crossing the Menai, he advanced into the interior, but he was met by Trahaiarn at Bronyr Erw and defeated and driven back to Anglesey, the expedition proving a failure. In the same year the grandsons of Bleddyn, Gronwy and Llewelyn ab Cadwgan, attempted to avenge the death of Bleddyn, but were unsuccessful, though they gained two fruitless victories according to some accounts, but there is some historical confusion. The last battle was in the year 1075 at Gwanythyd, or perhaps later on two years. A year or two afterwards the king of Gwynedd, Trahaiarn, marched against Rhys ab Owain, then the sole monarch of South Wales, and defeated him, and the whole family was overthrown and most of them perished. Such were the miserable disputes and wars among the Welsh princes when the Normans were gradually advancing into the country.

In the time of Bleddyn, king of Gwynedd, who reigned during the period of William the Conqueror, the kingdoms of Powys and Gwynedd were again united. Amidst the fluctuations of the times when Bleddyn died, his children did not succeed to the throne of Gwynedd, as shown above, but they did to Powys ; and the eldest son, Meredydd, after the usual warfare, became king of Powys. By this king the kingdom was divided, to take effect after his death, into two parts. The eldest son, Madoc, was to reign over the part known as Powys Fadoc, called after his own name ; the other son, Gruffydd, was appointed to reign over the other part, designated Gwenwynwyn. This division weakened the power of this state and led to its final destruction, though it continued for some time longer.

The history of South Wales during this period is one of much confusion and of internal discord and Norman aggression. The king of South Wales, Rhys ab Owain, was defeated and slain, as described above, and Rhys ab Tewdwr, a descendant of Rhodri Mawr, claimed the throne, and in 1077 became the king. There had been much misery and slaughter among the inhabitants owing to discords among the princes, leading to civil war ; and the people expected much from a descendant of the great Rhodri, but their hopes were not realised. During his reign the Danes, who were marauders and plunderers and who were called "black pagans," after harassing the coast of North Wales and spoiling Bangor, proceeded to South Wales and attacked St. David's and robbed the cathedral of its wealth and murdered the bishop, whose name was Abraham.

The throne of Rhys ab Tewdwr was not a peaceful one. About the year 1088 three sons of Bleddyn ab Cynvyn, the late king of Gwynedd, rose in rebellion against Rhys. Their names were Madog, Cadwgan, and Rhyrid, though there are some difficulties in the narrative. In this contest they were either the principals

or mere auxiliaries of Jestyn ab Gworgant of Morganwg. The first result of the contest was the defeat of Rhys, who fled to Ireland and returned in a few months with fresh troops, and a battle took place at Llechrid, when the rebels were defeated, and Madog and Rhyrid were slain and Cadwgan fled. The lord of Morganwg, Jestyn ab Gworgant, was an ambitious and tyrannical man, and by his disturbances and wars he caused much suffering to his people and left the impression of having been a cruel and unjust prince.

About the year 1090 the lord of Dimetia, who was subject to the king, Rhys ab Tewdwr, whose name was Cadivor ab Collwynn, died. His sons, Llewelyn and Einion, had some grievance against Rhys the king, and they induced Gruffydd ab Meredydd to commence a war against him. The result was a great defeat to Gruffydd at the battle of Llandydoch. He was taken prisoner and put to death. The others fled, and their lands were confiscated by Rhys. Einion, the chief cause of the war, fled for protection to his uncle Jestyn, prince of Morganwg, and afterwards in some capacity went to William Rufus, the English king, to induce him to render assistance against Rhys ab Tewdwr, the king of South Wales. This supplied an opportunity for the further interference of the Normans in the internal affairs of Wales.

The Norman method of gradual extension of their power among the Britons by the erection of castles in suitable localities and placing garrisons in them was formed by William the Conqueror himself, and was continued by his successors. William died in the year 1087, and was succeeded in England by his son William Rufus, or the Red, who reigned thirteen years, until the year 1100. William the Conqueror was of course a great commander and a great king, though under the circumstances a tyrant, especially to the English people. After the suppression of the rebellion, which originated in the north, he confiscated the property of the English landowners and divided it among his barons and soldiers. He claimed the land on the ground of conquest, and distributed it among his followers for services rendered and expected. He established the system known as feudalism. In the language of J. R. Green: "As the successor of Edward, William retained the judicial and administrative organisation of the older English realm. As the conqueror of England he introduced the military organisation of feudalism so far as was necessary for the secure possession of his conquests. The ground was already prepared for such an organisation; we have seen the beginnings of English feudalism in the warriors, 'the companions,' or 'theigns,' who were personally attached to the king's war-band and received estates from the royal domain in reward for their personal services. Two hundred manors in Kent, with an equal number elsewhere, rewarded the services of his brother Odo, and grants almost as large fell to the royal ministers, Fitz-Osbern and Montgomery, or to barons like the Mowbrays, the Warennes, and the Clares. But the poorest soldier of fortune found his part in the spoil. The

meanest Norman rose to wealth and power in the new dominion of his duke. Great or small however, each state thus held from the Crown was held by its tenant on condition of miltiary service at the royal call."

This quotation gives a description of the essential principles of feudalism established by the Conqueror in England. Another important work made by the Conqueror was the formation of Domesday Book, which contains a record or survey of all the lands in England. It did not embrace Wales nor Northumberland, Durham, Westmorland, and Cumberland—counties which long formed the kingdoms of Cumbria and Strathclyde, belonging to the ancient Britons of the north. It was intended to be the basis of taxation and a register of the tenure of the lands of the kingdom. This great work was effected by commissioners sent into each county to make the necessary inquiries. The commissioners began their work in the year 1080—some say later—and completed it in 1086, only one year before the death of William.

The establishment of the feudal system and the survey of the country were confined necessarily to England proper, but the application of their principles to Wales was to some extent made by the creation of the lordships which had their centre in the fortified castles erected on the boundary and in the interior of Wales by William and his successors, by which the land of the natives was confiscated and bestowed on Norman barons, who held it on condition of military service and at the call of the king. We have seen how William acted towards North Wales in the construction of castles at Chester, Rhuddlan, and Montgomery. The gradual conquest of South Wales was effected in the same way and with greater expedition. As an illustration we may refer to the ancient castle of Chepstow, erected on the bank of the river Wye close to the ancient boundary of South Wales. Its foundation is ascribed to William Fitz-Osbern, the minister of the Conqueror, who was commander at the great battle of Hastings, and was, jointly with Odo, governor of England during the absence of William in Normandy a few months after the battle of Hastings. The foundation must have been laid very early in the Norman period, for William Fitz-Osbern died in Flanders in the year 1070. The greater part of the castle was constructed long after Fitz-Osbern, but the foundation was by him. It is now a splendid ruin, but "portions of the old masonry of the eleventh century are still present in the lower part of the two end walls of the great hall." It was in its early days an effective barrier against enemies, and was separated from the town by a deep fosse, now grown over by trees. From this castle the Norman forces issued forth to subdue the Britons and seize their land. This Fitz-Osbern was made earl of Hereford by William and occupied the castle there, from which he commanded the surrounding district and proceeded against the Britons. Possessing these two strongholds—Hereford and Chepstow—the earl was in a position to invade Wales in different directions, and during his own life did not

hesitate to use his advantages and contribute to the conquest of South Wales.

Another distinguished Norman about this time played an important part in the conquest of South Wales, namely, Robert FitzHamon. He married the daughter of Roger Montgomery, and this increased his power. At this time Rhys ab Tewdwr was the reigning prince of Dimetia, or South Wales, and Jestyn was the reigning prince of Morganwg. The sons of Cadivor ab Collwynn, Llewelyn and Einion, together with Gruffydd ab Meredydd rebelled against Rhys ab Tewdwr as shown above, and were defeated. Einion induced the Normans under Robert FitzHamon to render assistance in a war against Rhys, the king of Dimetia. The Normans were glad to have the opportunity of pushing their conquests further into South Wales.

Einion came back from his visit to the king, William Rufus, bringing with him a Norman force consisting of the commander, Robert FitzHamon, and twelve knights, and some thousands of fighting-men. They seem to have come from England by sea and landed in Morganwg. This force was joined by the partisans of Einion and by the men of Morganwg. At this time Caredigion, or our Cardiganshire, was a separate lordship subject to the king of Dimetia. The lord of this district then was Cedrych ab Gwaethvoed. We hardly need have to inform English readers that in ancient times surnames did not exist in most nations, including Wales, and that men were distinguished one from another by adding the name of their father. *Ab* or *ap* in Welsh means son and is a contraction of *mab*, son, and is constantly used in Welsh history to distinguish one man of the same name from another. Cedrych, the lord of Caredigion, was the son of Gwaethvoed. This prince joined the followers of Einion and the Normans in the war against Rhys ab Tewdwr. The year following the arrival of the Normans was devoted to the war. The combined forces marched into the territory of Dimetia and, according to the custom of the times, ravaged the country and robbed and plundered in every direction. The king, Rhys ab Tewdwr, who is supposed to have been aged at the time of the war, marched out against his foes. The two armies met somewhere in Brecknockshire near the Black Mountain, and a great battle took place. The British troops were only slightly armed compared with the steel-clad Normans. The result was the defeat of Rhys and his army, and the king himself was slain. The kingdom of South Wales, or Deheubarth, fell to pieces and disorder prevailed. The Normans did not then advance to the capital and occupy the kingdom, but retired with their booty.

After this great defeat of the Britons of South Wales, other Welsh princes entered upon the unworthy task of plundering the country left without a king or effective government. The son of Bleddyn, the late king of Gwynedd, whose name was Cadwgan, joined in the work of plundering the kingdom of Dyved, or Dimetia. The Britons, or the Welsh, were a brave people in war,

as their long history shows, but they were sadly wanting in unity. Their numerous territorial divisions into many kingdoms, principalities, and lordships possessing semi-independence were a great source of weakness. Their tribal distinctions and jealousies added much to this weakness. The ancient Welsh principle of dividing their property among descendants and their mode of choosing their kings and princes led to incessant petty contests and warfare. The sons of former kings and princes who were deprived of their father's inheritance intrigued and conspired and joined in frequent wars against the actual rulers. These causes contributed through many centuries to the weakness and ultimately the conquest of the Britons. This was obviously the main cause of the fall of the kingdom of South Wales at the close of the eleventh century—during the reigns of William the Conqueror and his son William Rufus. A mere nominal unity though founded on a common basis of race without a real and administrative unity, can never suffice to secure the independence and the prosperity of a state. This is a lesson which applies to modern states as well as to ancient ones; hence we find in modern times states consolidating and strengthening themselves by greater organic unity.

The Welsh traditional account represents the Normans as in the act of leaving the Welsh shores of Morganwg by their ships when they were induced by Einion to return and complete their task by the conquest of Morganwg. Einion, it was said, was promised by Jestyn his daughter Nest in marriage if he would obtain the aid of the Normans against Rhys, the king of South Wales. The story implies that Jestyn as well as Einion was opposed to Rhys ab Tewdwr. When this had been done and Rhys had been conquered Jestyn refused to fulfil his promise to give his daughter to Einion. This excited the anger of Einion, and he proceeded to recall the Normans to conquer Morganwg. There is probably something mythical in the story. Thierry, in his "History of the Norman Conquest," omits this story and represents Robert FitzHamon as returning from the war against Rhys ab Tewdwr to his manors in Gloucester, and after a time returning to Wales and engaging in a war against Jestyn, prince of Morganwg. Both accounts involve the same fact that the Normans returned to complete their conquests.

The Normans, under their leader FitzHamon, proceeded to the war. There was an attempt at a compromise, but Jestyn in his strong temper refused any arrangement. Many natives followed Einion and Cedrych, lord of Caredigion. This was a serious combination against Jestyn. The two opposing forces met and a great battle was fought near Cardiff at the Great Heath. The result was the defeat of Jestyn's army and the overthrow of the lordship of Morganwg. The king Jestyn fled and died an exile. The result of this war was the breaking up to a large extent of the kingdom of South Wales, then called Dynefawr, or Dimetia. It consisted of six parts, or lordships—namely, Caredigion, corresponding generally to our Cardiganshire; Dyfed, the country now known

as Pembrokeshire ; Caerfyrddin, or our Caermarthen ; Morganwg, equal roughly to Glamorganshire, but larger ; Gwent, now Monmouthshire, and Brycheiniog, or Brecknockshire. The lordship of Morganwg was then an important one, as is the modern county, deriving its name therefrom. When the rulers and people of these two provinces, Morganwg and Caredigion, united with the Normans against the king of South Wales, it is not wonderful that he was defeated. The war, however, was a severe one, and the native troops who fought on the side of the Normans, having been placed in the front of the battle, suffered much and were unable to make any serious stand against the demands of the Normans when the war was over.

After the defeat of the kingdom of South Wales the Normans proceeded to divide the country, and appropriated the best portions of the land amongst themselves and assigned to their British allies the most unfertile and barren parts of the land. This is generally the lot of disloyal natives who invite foreigners to aid them against their own countrymen. The ancient Britons had this experience when in the fifth century they invited the Saxons to aid them against the Picts and Scots. The Normans, after the defeat of Morganwg, advanced further into South Wales—to Caredigion and Dyfed—which, after the defeat and death of Rhys ab Tewdwr, was in a condition of civil war. The events described above occurred during the reigns of William the Conqueror and William Rufus his son, in the latter part of the eleventh century. The Normans in this period made considerable progress in the conquest of Wales, but two more centuries were to pass before the conquest was completed. It has been estimated that at the end of the eleventh century more than half of the Welsh territory within the dyke constructed by Offa was in the possession of the Normans, and held by means of the castles erected on the borders and on several districts in the interior. The castle of Chester, held by Hugh Lupus, made earl of Chester, dominated the district, now Flintshire, and extended as far as Rhuddlan, where a castle was erected. This portion of the country formed part of the kingdom of Gwynedd, and separated therefrom by the Normans. A rich portion of Montgomeryshire, which formed a portion of the ancient kingdom of Powys, was seized by the Normans, and Roger de Montgomery, the earl of Shrewsbury, constructed the castle of Montgomery as previously described. The occupation of this castle was contested by the Welsh and was taken and retaken, but remained in the hands of the Normans. The castles of Hereford and Chepstow were held by the Norman baron William Fitz-Osbern and his successors, and dominated the Welsh districts adjoining. The progress of the Normans in South Wales was still greater, and castles were constructed even as far as Cardiganshire and Pembrokeshire. Such was the condition of Wales at the close of the eleventh century.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

We now come to a period in British history embracing about two centuries, during which the Welsh and the Normans were engaged in frequent wars, ending, however, in the final conquest of Wales by the Normans. The close of the eleventh century left the greater part of South Wales in the occupation of the Normans, held by strong castles garrisoned by troops under their command. The Welsh were still under the rule of their own princes and held portions of the land, but in constant warfare with their foes and with themselves.

North Wales was more independent than the South. The mountainous region of Snowdon was the place of refuge where the Welsh retired in times of difficulty, and often were able to defend themselves and drive back the enemy. The district now known as Flintshire at the beginning of this period was in the possession of the Normans dominated by the castles of Chester and Rhuddlan. The remainder of the North Wales kingdom, known under the name of Gwynedd, whose capital and royal residence were Aberfraw in Anglesey, now a small place, was still independent. The reigning sovereign of this kingdom at the beginning of the twelfth century was Gruffydd ab Cynan. This prince was the son of Iago ab Idwal, king of Gwynedd, and he claimed the throne as his descendant. After the death or assassination of Bleddyn, which took place about the year 1073, Trahaiarn ab Caradawg ascended the throne of Gwynedd, but not legally. He reigned for a few years. Then in the year 1077 or thereabout Gruffydd ab Cynan, who had previously gained Anglesey, began a war in support of his claim. He was aided by the then powerful king of South Wales, Rhys ab Tewdwr, or Tudor. The contending armies met in the county of Montgomery amid the hills of the village of Carno. The battle was a very severe and bloody one. Trahaiarn was defeated and slain, or perished on the battlefield rather than seek safety by flight. The result of this great battle was to place Gruffydd ab Cynan on the throne of Gwynedd. According to the "Annales" this prince reigned with great dignity for the unusual period of fifty-seven years. He died in the year 1137. Gruffydd was a man of many qualities, and he governed his

kingdom with much energy and success. He was a friend of the Church and promoted the building of churches. He lived to be eighty-two years of age. The last years of his reign were peaceful, and at the closing period of life he assumed the habit of the monk. He was sometimes on friendly terms with the Normans who occupied a part of his kingdom of Gwynedd. It was said, however, that he laid the foundation of that opposition to their domination which was pursued by his successors. He died at Bangor in the year 1137, and was interred there.

The Normans never ceased to push their conquests into Wales, but they met in North Wales many impediments to their progress, much more than in South Wales. The North Wales people were not as divided as those of South Wales. The kingdom of Gwynedd remained more united, or, perhaps, less divided, and the principality of Powys generally followed the destiny of Gwynedd. The Normans soon gained possession of that part of Gwynedd which corresponds with Flintshire through the agency of the earls of Chester, who pursued the Norman plan of building castles and making them the centre of operations in the districts around and even beyond. The castles of Chester and Rhuddlan and others of less importance served this purpose from the time of Earl Hugh Lupus. The mountainous region of Snowdon was often made the refuge of the Britons when obliged to retire before the advancing Normans. There they managed to defend themselves and repel the attacks of their foes.

The Normans were not free from dissensions, and in the reign of Rufus this was shown in a kind of rebellion which had its centre at Hereford and which extended into Worcestershire. The Norman nobles quarrelled among themselves. The men of Hereford and Shropshire joined in the rebellion, and the Welsh, always warlike, took their share in the movement. This, however, was not of much importance in British history except to show to the Normans the importance of entirely subduing the Britons and annexing their country to England. The war begun by the Conqueror was continued by William Rufus and his successors. Whilst Robert of Rhuddlan was away in England, engaged in a cruel war, the Welsh king, Gruffydd ab Cynan, advanced in the year 1088 to Rhuddlan and inflicted much injury on the district, killing many and taking many prisoners who, after the cruel customs of the age, were sold for slaves. This Robert was the nephew of the earl of Chester, Hugh Lupus, and was the man who captured Rhuddlan and fortified it strongly and made it his residence. From this strong position he became a source of trouble to the Welsh and succeeded in acquiring and maintaining the surrounding district as part of the Flintshire which in part constituted the earldom of Chester within the enlarged boundary of England. When Robert Rhuddlan had finished his fighting in the south of England by the surrender of Rochester, he returned to Wales very wrathful on account of the ravage of his domain of Rhuddlan by the king of Gwynedd. When he returned the Welsh had retired from Rhuddlan. Robert advanced from this

castle to "the peninsula of Dwyganwy," the neighbourhood of Ormes Head, a name derived from the Scandinavians, or northern rovers. Here, alas! he lost his life by the action of the Welsh, and he was buried in the St. Werburh's minster of Chester, July, 1088.

During the reign of William Rufus several attempts were made to conquer North Wales, but they were unsuccessful. In the year 1095 there was an expedition against Wales. In the previous year, 1094, as described on preceding pages, the Welsh captured the castle of Montgomery, which had been acquired and fortified by Roger de Montgomery, the earl of Shrewsbury; and they destroyed the garrison and ravaged the district. This had enraged the king and led him to march against the place and recapture it and the surrounding district. Then he proceeded against the kingdom of Gwynedd. He arrived in the region of Snowdon. This was in the month of November—not a very congenial time for a war in such a country. The campaign was not successful and Rufus retired to England. Subsequent expeditions were more successful for the Normans, but though triumphant in South Wales they failed to subdue the brave men of Gwynedd. William Rufus died on the 2nd of August, 1100, buried on the following day, and was succeeded by the youngest son of the Conqueror, who became Henry I. William II. was called Rufus, the Red, because of the ruddiness of his hair and his countenance. He was, as a king, cruel, and allowed his followers to oppress the people. His life was excessively profligate and irreligious. He was supposed to be a sceptic in religion. The following general description of him by E. A. Freeman in his book, "The Reign of William Rufus" (vol. ii. p. 147) must suffice here: "The excesses of the followers of Rufus, the reign of unright and unlaw which they brought with them, did or threatened harm to every man in his dominions; the occasional cruelties of Henry hurt only a few people, while the general strictness of his rule profited every one. What makes William Rufus stand out personally in so specially hateful a light is not so much deeds of personal cruelty as indulgence in the foulest forms of vice, combined with a form of irreligion which startled not only saints but ordinary sinners."

The wars of the Normans against the Welsh were continuous under the reign of Rufus. In the language of Dr. Freeman, "The affairs of Wales are still more constantly coming before our eyes. While the Red King is on the throne, Welsh warfare supplies year after year no small part of the events which the chronicler of England has to record. The British story . . . is the story of disunion in its strongest form. Alike in victory and in defeat all is local and personal: common action on the part of the whole nation seems impossible. The result of English dealings with Wales during these years may be summed up as immediate loss and final success—as defeat in detail leading to substantial conquest." This remark of Freeman is quite correct, as we have often shown in the course of our narrative. The Welsh princes and people suffered more from disunion than from any other cause. They

fought bravely in the field in separate engagements and yet generally lost. When beaten in the plains they retired to their mountains and were there inaccessible, but when they returned on the retirement of their foes, they found a Norman castle had been constructed, the district around settled by strangers under the protection of the castle. "The lands might be harried, the castle might at some favourable moment be broken down, but it was sure to spring up again and again do its work. The lasting possession of the fertile land had passed away to the invaders ; the moors and the mountains alone were left to the sons of the soil" (Freeman). Wales is the land of castles ; they meet us, great or small, in most districts, or their ruins. It was necessary for the Normans to strengthen every height and guard every pass while the moors and mountains of the Cymry remained unsubdued. The towns, nearly all of English foundation, were small military colonies. So Freeman contends.

The death of Robert of Rhuddlan was a great blow to the Normans of the earldom of Chester, but it did not seriously interfere with their progress in extending their domination in North Wales. The earl of Chester, Hugh Lupus, was not content to hold Flintshire, he advanced into Anglesey and, according to the Norman custom, built a castle, probably at Aberlleiniog, or Aber Lleinawg, on the eastern coast. It was a square fort of small dimensions, had a square tower in the centre and a round tower at each corner, and the whole surrounded by a foss. There was a hollow way from the castle to the shore, ending in a mound of earth intended as a landing-stage. The Norman troops evidently reached Anglesey by sea. The castle continued for many centuries and had a garrison in the time of Charles the First. This invasion of Anglesey by the great earl, aided by the earl of Shrewsbury, took place in the year 1098. The Normans treated the natives with great cruelty, and especially a priest of the name of Kendred.

About the same time the Normans under the earl Roger of Shrewsbury pressed on their conquests in Powys, using the castle of Montgomery as the starting-place for the expedition. The Welsh took advantage of favourable circumstances and again rose against Norman domination. They even invaded those districts that belonged to England, such as Herefordshire, Shropshire, and Cheshire. They slew the Normans and the English alike, ravaging the country and carrying off great plunder. The kingdom of Gwynedd was delivered from Norman tyranny. The Welsh troops crossed over to Anglesey, destroyed the castles, including that of Aberlleiniog, and brought to an end for the time the power of the foreigners in Anglesey. The two earls, both Hughs—the one of Chester and the other of Shrewsbury—marched an army into the kingdom of Gwynedd and restored the domination of the Normans in the valleys. William Rufus himself in the year 1095 entered North Wales and marched to the region of Snowdon, where his divided troops came together. The Welsh retired to the mountains. The winter came on, and Rufus, unable to do anything

important in the cold season, retired to England. The campaign was a failure. In the same year, as previously narrated, the castle of Montgomery was retaken and the Norman garrison slain. Thus for the time being the two kingdoms, Gwynedd and Powys, were in the hands of the Welsh, except some of the plains still held by the earl of Chester. This was the position of North Wales during the remaining portion of Rufus's reign and for many years afterwards.

In South Wales, as previously described, the success of the Normans during this period was much greater, owing in part to the divisions among the princes and people, as shown in the last chapter. We brought our history of the conquest of South Wales in the last chapter to the time when Rhys ab Tewdwr, the king of South Wales, was defeated and slain and his kingdom largely broken up ; and when the principality of Morganwg was overthrown and Jestyn, the reigning prince, was defeated and became an exile, through the intrigue of Einion and the power of FitzHamon. The story as handed down by the Britons is generally regarded by critics as largely mythical, but the general truth is admitted that FitzHamon did conquer Deheubarth, or South Wales, and Morganwg, and did occupy Cardiff, the capital. This great man held a position of influence in Gloucestershire and Somerset ; his wife was the daughter of Earl Roger, and his daughter, Mabel, became the wife of Robert, earl of Gloucester, the natural son of King Henry I. It was common in those days for illegitimate children to attain to positions of influence. He robbed the churches of Wales and thereby enriched the abbeys of Gloucester and Tewkesbury. The capital of Morganwg was Cardiff, the Caer or fort on the Taff.

The followers of FitzHamon made settlements in South Wales and Morganwg after the conquests described. According to Freeman they were Normans, English, and Flemings, and they came mostly from Gloucestershire and Somersetshire. They were able to maintain these settlements by means of the castles erected in the several districts. Cardiff, Kenefig Aberafan, Neath, Cowbridge, Llantrissit were towns which arose in Morganwg under the protection of Norman defences. The conquests were soon extended beyond Morganwg. The district of Brycheiniog, our Breckonshire, was conquered by Bernard Newmarch, and the position was maintained by the castle which the conqueror had constructed on the hill of Aberhondy, the basis of the more important castle of Brecknock. Pembroke, the ancient Dyfed, was invaded and occupied, and castles were constructed at Pembroke, Tenby, Haverfordwest, and many other places.

The Welsh, however, did not long remain submissive under the Norman yoke. As in North Wales previously narrated, so in South Wales. Under Cadwgan ap Bleddyn the movement extended and nearly all the castles were captured and destroyed. Two castles only held out—Pembroke under Gerald of Windsor, and Rhyd-y-Gors under William, son of Baldwyn. The south-western part of Wales was turned into a desert. The men and the cattle were

largely removed to those regions where there was greater safety. Such was war in those days.

The parts of Wales called Gower in Pembrokeshire and Caermarthen were not conquered at the same time as Morganwy and Caredigion. The Normans, however, soon afterwards made a successful attack on these districts. Gower and the Vale of Towy were ravaged and wasted. The country was occupied and settled by the invaders, consisting mostly of Saxons from Somersetshire. Castles as usual were erected at Swansea and Aberllwchr and elsewhere. The year following, 1096, saw another movement. On the death of William, son of Baldwyn, who had held under varied circumstances the castle of Rhyd-y-Gors, the Welsh seized the place. They made another effort for freedom and rose in Brycheiniog, Gwent, and Gwenllwg and asserted their freedom. The lord marchers made an attempt to restore their power and marched an army into Gwent, roughly our Monmouthshire, but in vain. The English retreated from Gwent and were attacked in their retreat and put to flight. This principality, which was conquered by the English under Harold, was lost for the time being. The second invasion was unsuccessful, and the Anglo-Norman army had to retire, attacked and cut up by the Welsh under Gruffydd and Ivor, the grandsons of Cadwgan, at a place named Aberllech. The victories of the Welsh during these years seemed complete over the invading armies, but the result was only temporary. The Normans still held the most important castles which really dominated the districts around. The Britons gained for a time the open country, and had destroyed many of the smaller castles. Even the strong fortress of Rhyd-y-Gors had been captured by the Welsh. The castle of Pembroke still held out, commanded by Gerald of Windsor, the Norman. The Welsh, under many chiefs, resolved to attack this stronghold. This was probably in the year 1097, some four years after the death of Rhys ab Tewdwr and the apparent collapse of his kingdom. By the employment of certain devices Gerald led the Welsh to retire from the siege and to postpone it for some months. This gave an opportunity to the garrison to obtain additional supplies ; and we find that Gerald was enabled to issue from the castle and to devastate the country as far as the neighbourhood of St. David's.

The king, Rufus, excited by the triumph of the Welsh, north and south, resolved upon another campaign against them—the third he had devised. He had, however, no great success. He determined to adopt another policy—that of building castles, by the instrumentality of certain barons, men of military skill. In the year 1098 a powerful man was sent over from France, whose name was Robert of Bellisme. He was given large estates and invested with great power. On the death of Roger of Montgomery the earl, Robert of Bellisme was appointed in his place as the earl of Shrewsbury and Montgomery. He carried out the policy of Rufus by the erection of new castles. He was cruel to the utmost extent. In the language of Freeman, "he spared no man, of what-

ever race or order, whose lands lay conveniently to his hand, nor did he scruple to take away from the saints themselves what the men of the elder time had given them. But Robert of Bellisme was something more than an ordinary plunderer; he was a man of genius in his way. He built a strong fortress at Bridgenorth in Shropshire for the defence of the middle course of the Severn, mindful of the fact that only four years previously the Welsh had invaded Shropshire and Herefordshire and ravaged the country. There were some forts in the district before his time—Danesford, Oldburg, Inatford, and Burt Castle." The new castle became the chief residence of Robert Bellisme. The conquest of the country during the last years of Rufus's reign progressed not by successes in the field but by the building of castles as the centres of operation. Cadwgan, the son of Bleddyn, after many changes became prince of Caredigion, and Gruffydd ab Cynan became the settled king of Gwynedd, which he retained for a long period.

In the early years of the reign of Henry I. there was a rebellion against the king on the part of some of the nobles. The chief of the nobles was Robert of Bellisme, the French nobleman who had attained to eminence and was made the earl of Shrewsbury. In this hostility Robert managed by many great promises to win over some of the Welsh princes and many soldiers. He also obtained the aid of some Irish and Norwegians. Both sides prepared for the contest. Robert put his castles in order, including those of Shrewsbury and Bridgenorth, besides Arundel and Tickhill. The castles of Arundel and Tickhill in the north surrendered to the royal troops, and Henry marched to Bridgenorth, the chief centre of the rebel forces, then placed by Robert under the command of three captains—Robert, son of Corbet, another Robert, and Wulfgar the huntsman. The Welsh troops, under Cadwgan and Iorwerth, were placed in the neighbourhood. The royal army arrived at Bridgenorth, and the siege of the place was begun. The garrison was divided in their leanings. The leaders were on the side of Robert of Bellisme, but the smaller men, who were partly English and partly Normans, were inclined to the side of Henry. The nobles, without the knowledge of the soldiers, tried by an interview to make peace with the king, but failed. The mass of the army then communicated with the king and their advice was listened to by him. Henry then opened communications with the Welsh commanders whose troops, several thousands in number, were posted near the town, and he succeeded in detaching the Welsh from the cause of Robert. The negotiation was carried on by William Pantulf on the part of the king and Iorwerth for the Welsh, though unknown to the other Welsh princes. Iorwerth was also admitted to the presence of the king. The king made large promises if the princes and army came over to his side. Iorwerth was promised free from tribute and homage the principalities of Powys and Caredigion, the half of Dyfed, the strong castle of Pembroke, and the Vale of Teifi, Kidwelly, and Gower. This, under the circumstances, was a generous promise, as it

embraced most of South Wales and left to the English only Morganwg, Gwent, and Brycheiniog, and part of Dyfed, then held by the son of Baldwyn. The arrangement made by Iorwerth was not known or assented to by Cadwgan and Meredydd his brothers; and for a time they remained on the side of Robert.

The result of the double negotiation described was that the garrison of Bridgenorth surrendered, going forth with the honours of war, some returning home and others probably entering the king's service. The Welsh returned to Wales, and on their way wasted the territory of Robert and carried off much booty. Robert was then in the castle of Shrewsbury, the only one left to him. Henry, at the head of his troops, advanced to Shrewsbury. His army was estimated at 60,000, probably a great exaggeration. On the way he was met by an embassy from the great earl asking for peace. The request was refused, and Robert was informed that he must surrender unconditionally if he was to have any mercy. This he ultimately did. His life was spared, but he was banished to his native Normandy, where he lived for some time still a disturber and died under a cloud.

The large promises which Henry had made to Iorwerth were not fulfilled. The strong castle of Pembroke was denied him and was given to a Norman knight named Saer, and afterwards to Gerald of Windsor, who had previously defended it against the Welsh, as described above. With the castle went the half of Dyfed promised. The Vale of Teifi, Gower, and Kidwelly were also refused him and handed over to Howel ab Gronwy, a Welshman. There remained of the promise the principality of Powys and Caredigion, or our Cardiganshire. Iorwerth made the agreement with Henry without the consent of his brothers. On his return to Wales after the surrender of Bridgenorth Iorwerth waged war against his brothers and actually cast his brother Meredydd into prison. He, however, came to an agreement with his brother Cadwgan, and give him the principality of Caredigion and part of Powys, the former of which he held under Robert of Bellisme. Iorwerth must have offended Henry, perhaps by his generous treatment of his brother Cadwgan and by some other deeds. He was not only refused the fulfilment of promises, but he was summoned to appear before an assembly at Shrewsbury and to be tried on certain charges not fully recorded. After a trial of one day Iorwerth was found guilty and sent to prison, but afterwards liberated and permitted to return to Wales. The Welsh account was that he was cast into the king's prison, "not according to law, but according to power." The surrender of Bridgenorth took place in the year 1102, and the trial of Iorwerth in the following year.

The settlement of territory narrated above did not last long. The Welshman, Howel ab Gronwy, who had been given the district of the Teifi, Gower, and Kidwelly, was after about four years attacked by Fitz-Baldwin, the prince of one-half of Dyfed, and expelled from his dominions. Howel, however, did not submit

but returned to his country, and in the usual style destroyed the crops, carried off cattle, burnt houses, slew many Normans, and subdued the country, except the castles, which were held for the Normans. The Normans suffered so much that they retreated towards England, losing many men in their retreat. This war was not apparently under the orders of King Henry, but arose from the ambition and greed of the provincial governors. Henry was in fact displeased, and took Dyfed from the knight who held it and gave it to Gerald of Windsor. Howel was not allowed to enjoy his victory long. What the Normans could not do by arms they resolved to accomplish by treachery. They hired a traitor, Cwgan ap Meirig, to murder him. He invited Howel to a feast and informed the Normans of the arrangement. They came during the early morning when Howel was in bed, and under Cwgan's leadership they murdered him.

In the early part of the twelfth century a settlement of Flemings took place in Pembrokeshire. They were of the Low Dutch of Holland. They were to some extent mercenary soldiers employed by the Normans, but others of them were industrious people who had been driven from some districts in the Low Countries by inundations of the sea. They brought with them industrious habits and some of the arts of life, of manufacturing industry. They were skilled in the manufactures of flax and wool. At this time Flanders was supplying Europe with much of the textile fabrics then used. Henry I. of England conceived the plan of forming Flemish settlements in South Wales for the purpose of an English garrison to aid in keeping in subjection the troublesome Britons. The first settlement was made in the year 1111 ; others followed. The Flemings were planted in certain districts in Pembrokeshire and in Gower, which is now within the boundary of Glamorganshire, though formerly part of Dyfed or Pembrokeshire. On this point the following remarks are made in the Blue Book (The Royal Commission on Land in Wales, 1896, p. 75.) "In fact there is reason to believe that in the time of the early Norman kings Flemings settled in considerable numbers in this country. They appear to have been unpopular both with Normans and Saxons, and it occurred to Henry I. to make use of them, first as a check on the Scotch and afterwards on the Welsh. He settled them first in waste lands on the Tweed, but later he is said to have transported them bag and baggage to the Hundred of Roose (or Rhos), in Pembrokeshire. It is observed that Roose is remarkable for its comparative absence of Welsh place-names, and it may be concluded that the Flemings cleared it of what Welsh inhabitants there may have been there. The settlers made themselves masters of the rest of South Pembrokeshire, but as more Welsh names survive there, it is not probable that the newcomers made a clean sweep of the previous inhabitants. The question how far this Flemish settlement was really Flemish and not English is one of considerable difficulty. In case it was purely or mainly Flemish, one is tempted to ask why the language of the district is now a

dialect of English any more than that of Flanders, where Flemish shows no innate tendency to become English. To this it has been replied that the Fleming of Pembrokeshire now speaks English for the same general reason that the Dane of Lincolnshire speaks English; and it may be readily admitted that the influence of the Church and of the castles in the district, combined with an inveterate hatred of the neighbouring Welsh, must have amply made up for the isolation from the body of the English world. On the other hand, one of the greatest authorities on English dialects (Mr. A. J. Ellis) has examined the linguistic evidence and declared that it breaks down. At most, he thought, there could only have been a subordinate Flemish element, which soon lost all traces of its original and but slightly different dialect, while the principal element must have been Saxon, as in Gower and the Irish baronies of Bargy and Forth, forming the south-east corner of Ireland."

"Settlements of a still more obscure history were made here and there on the rest of the coast from St. Govan's Head to the mouth of the Severn, but far the most important must have been the group which made most of the peninsula of Gwyr, or Gower, into a non-Welsh district, now known as English Gower, and in Welsh as Bro-Wyr, the march or country of Gower. Gower and South Pembrokeshire, which are mutually visible and enjoy the same dialect of English, may be supposed to have been at one time in close communication with one another by sea. The establishment of Flemings and Englishmen in Gower and the geographical position of their country would naturally suggest a distinct lordship, which we have as the seigniory of Gower; it has been referred to more than once in the evidence taken by us in Glamorganshire. A great part of the south of Glamorgan is called in Welsh Bro Morganwg, the march, margin, or country of Glamorgan, a term incorrectly rendered into English as 'The Vale of Glamorgan.'"

That there were at different times in the twelfth century Flemings settled in Pembrokeshire and Gower cannot be reasonably doubted. That many English were also settled in the same districts, and to some extent associated with them, is probable. The various incursions made by the Normans and English into South Wales resulted in settlements of the English under the protection of the castles. In Pembrokeshire about a dozen castles were erected during the struggles between the Welsh and their enemies, of which Pembroke was the most important. Gower, which is now in Glamorganshire, anciently belonged to Pembrokeshire, the old principality of Dyfed. Here also, and in other portions of the district, including Cardiff, castles were constructed. This portion of Wales has been called "Little England beyond Wales." "The posterity of these settlers are still distinguished from the ancient British population by their language, manners and customs." Freeman remarks that this Low-Dutch settlement in Britain, forming a wholly separate people from their British neighbours, still speak a form of the tongue once common to

Angle, Saxon, and Fleming. In course of time the races became reconciled and intermarried, and the sharp distinctions of ancient times have largely disappeared, though sufficient remain to indicate the ancient differences. In the Flemish districts of Pembrokeshire and Glamorgan, by whatever means, whether by actual massacre or by mere driving beyond the frontier, the British inhabitants vanished. The land received, and it has kept to this day, a new people, a new language, a new local nomenclature. In short, the settlement of Robert FitzHamon, Gilbert of Clare, and their fellows in Wales, simply answered to the settlement of themselves or their fathers in England, while the settlement of the Flemings in Dyfed and Gower answers to the earlier settlement of the Angles and Saxons in the larger part of Britain" (Freeman).

There can be no doubt that the Flemish settlement answered the purpose of the English king to aid in the subjugation of the country to the supreme authority of England. For many generations there was a strong antagonism between the races, and war frequently broke out between them. During the reign of Henry I. there was comparative peace, but he died December 1, 1135, in Normandy, and his body was brought over to England and interred in the minster at Reading, which he himself had erected. Soon after his death there was a serious war between the Welsh and the Normans and their allies. In the years 1136–1137, the Welsh revolt began and spread. The presence of the Flemings and their occupation of the land was very hateful to the Welsh. The first attack in this revolt was therefore made upon them. They advanced into Gower, one important part of the Flemish colony, and inflicted much injury, destroying everything before them. The Norman soldiers, about 500 strong, formed themselves into a wedge-like order to resist the furious Welsh, but all in vain. The impetuous attack of the Welsh broke the Norman ranks, and they were all slain. The noted earl of Clare, Richard Fitz-Gilbert, was with his retainers on his way to his earldom in Pembrokeshire, and, while passing through the vale of Gronwy, was met by the Welsh under Morgan ab Owain and his brother Iorwerth, who suddenly springing from a thicket fell upon them and slew them all. The English king, Stephen, sent some assistance to his barons in South Wales, but to no purpose. He was at that time otherwise engaged in the maintenance of his own throne, and he resolved for the present to leave the Welsh to themselves. The revolt continued. Sometimes the Normans gained some local victories, but the Welsh generally triumphed along the whole line. Robert, the son of Harold, lord of Ewias; Miles, earl of Hereford afterwards; Baldwyn of Clare; Payne Fitz-John—all failed against the brave and stubborn Welsh. The revolt extended to Caredigion. The Norman castles were destroyed, and even new castles were built by the Welsh in imitation of their Norman foes. The castle of the slain Earl Fitz-Gilbert, at Penbroch, was beseiged, but successfully defended by his widow, who was the sister of the earl of Chester. The widow was rescued by Milo,

earl of Gloucester, who succeeded by a sudden attack in dispersing the besiegers, and carried away in triumph the heroic countess. The castle, however, was occupied by the Welsh.

During this period Gruffydd ab Rhys went to North Wales to obtain the aid of the king of Gwynedd. During his absence his wife, who was the daughter of the noted king of Gwynedd, Gruffydd ab Cynan, led an expedition into the territory of the Norman lords. She was attended by her sons, Morgan and Maelgwn, and all the forces she could collect. They met the Normans under Maurice de Londres at Cydweli, where a battle was fought, resulting in the defeat of the Britons. Morgan was killed, and Maelgwn and the heroic but imprudent lady were made prisoners along with many of the warriors. The lady and some of her followers were put to death. Such was war in those days. The mission of Gruffydd ab Rhys was successful, and two sons of the king of Gwynedd—Cadwaladr and Owain Gwynedd—placed themselves at the head of an army and marched against the Normans and the Flemings of South Wales.

The army from Gwynedd entered Caredigion, our Cardiganshire, and carried everything before them, even the castles held by the Normans. They began by attacking the strong castle of Aberystwith. This castle was under the command of Walter of Espec, and had a strong garrison. The Welsh, however, succeeded in burning and destroying the castle, and then took possession. The ruins of this fine castle continue to the present. After this successful beginning, the Welsh army proceeded to attack other strongholds, in which they were joined by the troops of Howel ap Meredydd and Rhys ab Madoc. The castles of Dinerth and Caerwedros, and that of Richard de la Mare were taken. The army from Gwynedd returned home for a short time laden with much booty, but they resumed operations later on in the year 1136, probably in October. In this second expedition the Welsh army from the north, aided by the Welsh of the south, under Gruffydd ab Rhys, estimated at 6,000 infantry and 2,000 cavalry, extended their ravages beyond the district they had previously visited in Caredigion, and drove out many of the settlers, English and Flemings, and replaced them with Welshmen who had been driven out by the foreign intruders. The scene of these operations was mainly the district in which the town of Aberteivi, or our Cardigan, was situated. The Norman lords, Stephen, the constable of Aberteify, Robert Fitz-Martin, the sons of Gerald de Windsor, previously mentioned, and William Fitz-John, collected all the troops under their authority and advanced against the triumphant Welsh army. The opposing forces met somewhere near the renowned river Teivy. The armies were on both sides large, and a pitched battle was fought, which ended in a great victory for the Welsh. According to the narratives of Welsh and English historians, 3,000 Normans fell in this battle, killed or wounded. The remainder of the Norman army fled, and sought the shelter of their fortresses. They rushed in their flight over the

bridge that crossed the Teivy. This bridge, doubtless a feeble wooden structure, broke down, and many men and horses were drowned. Many of the fugitives, cut off from the means of escape, were made prisoners. The noted Prince Einion ab Owain was slain. The Welsh troops then overran the country under the domination of the Normans, and took much spoil, including horses of the Flemish breed. The commander of the Welsh combined army is mentioned in the "Annales Cambriæ" as Gruffydd ab Rhys, but Owen Gwynedd seemed the most important person. The king of England, Stephen, who succeeded Henry I. in the year 1135, was too busy in the affairs of England and in the establishment of his own throne to allow him to interfere much in the affairs of Wales. This was left to his lords who were in the occupation of castles. The earl of Chester at this time—1136–7—was Ranulph, and in retaliation for the assistance rendered to South Wales by the kingdom of Gwynedd, sent an expedition against it not of a formidable nature, but it was a great failure. They fell into an ambuscade prepared for them by the Welsh, and all perished except the earl and five of his followers. The king is represented as sending Baldwyn, brother of Richard Fitz-Gilbert, to aid in putting down the revolt in South Wales with only 500 men, probably intended only as the leaders to a larger number to be raised in Wales. As they approached the castle of Brecknock they learned that the Welsh were advancing against them, and, being such a feeble body, they held a council, and they determined to retreat. This may have been prudent and not cowardice as some have represented. Another of the small expeditions sent by Stephen against the South Wales revolt was under Robert Fitz-Harold. He made some progress, and fortified and garrisoned a castle, but his men mostly perished, and he returned to England with some of his men to seek for reinforcements. No such fresh forces were forthcoming, the castle was taken and occupied by the Welsh, and the expedition was a failure. Stephen then resolved, as before explained, to leave the Welsh to themselves. In South Wales the land had been neglected, and famine and pestilence followed, and the Welsh warred amongst themselves.

About the year 1137 the great prince of Wales, Gruffydd ab Rhys, king of Deheubarth, died, and there was sorrow on that account. One account states that he was murdered by his wife, whose name was Gwenlliant, who was a daughter of the distinguished king of Gwynedd, Gruffydd ab Cynan. This is, however, inconsistent with a previous statement that she was made prisoner and put to death by the Normans under Maurice de Londres the year before, as the result of a war undertaken by her during the absence of her husband. Both accounts cannot be true; probably the latter is correct.

The events described above, which show that the Welsh were successful in the wars against the Normans and Flemings, were possible because Stephen, the king of England, was too much

engaged with the disorders of his own dominion to render any effectual assistance to his barons in Wales. Such were the anomalies of the times that Welsh mercenaries were employed in England in the civil war carried on between Stephen and his Norman lords. It seems they were present under the command of Meredydd and Cadwaladr at the battle of Lincoln, 1141 A.D., when Stephen was made prisoner. They contributed much by their numbers and bravery, though badly armed, to the final result. The earl of Chester, Ranulf, and Geoffrey Talbot had Welsh mercenaries in their service in the baronial war against Stephen. Probably most of the Welsh mercenaries were taken from those districts, such as Flintshire, that were included in the lordships of the Norman barons.

The internal discords of the Welsh were the cause of many of their misfortunes, defeats, and final subjugation. About this time, A.D. 1140–2, there were many feuds among the Welsh princes. Cynwrig ap Owain was murdered by Howel or by Madoc ap Meredydd. Meredydd ap Howel was slain by the sons of Bleddyn ap Gwyn. Howel ap Meredydd was slain by Rhys ap Howel. Howel and Cadwgan, sons of Madog ap Idnerth, slew each other. These names are rather confusing to modern readers, but the narrative indicates the domestic disorder among the Welsh of those ancient times. Some accounts, however, state that the deaths of some of those named were due to the Flemings. Personal quarrels and ambition led to feuds and murders even amongst noble relatives. At this time there was a quarrel between Anarawd ap Gruffydd ap Rhys and Cadwaladr ap Gruffydd ap Cynan. The latter was the brother of Owain Gwynedd, the prince of Gwynedd, and he was the father-in-law of Anarawd. The quarrel led to action, and Anarawd was killed. The Welsh lost by this murder a great man, whom they regarded then as the hope and stay of Dinevwr, or Dimetia. The prince of North Wales, Owain, was so angry with his brother on account of the murder that he with his son Howel placed himself at the head of an army and marched into South Wales, ravaged his lands in the style of the age, and destroyed the castle of Aberystwith. Cadwaladr must have been at this time the governing prince of Caredigion. He was no match for the powerful prince of Gwynedd, and fled to Ireland, with the intention of hiring mercenaries Irish and Scotch. The mercenaries were purchased and a war seemed probable between the two brothers, but a reconciliation took place before the war was begun. The mercenaries were dismissed, and, fearing they would lose their pay, they imprisoned Cadwaladr until their demand for pay was met. He gave them 2,000 heads of cattle and the booty they had seized in their march. Cadwaladr, however, broke his promise to his mercenaries, and employed his brother's troops to recover his cattle and booty, and having slain some of the men, he dismissed the remainder to return to Ireland, of course under a deep sense of wrong and with much indignation.

About this time the Norman, Hugh de Mortimer, took an active

part against the Welsh in other localities. He pursued the usual Norman practice of building or fortifying castles as centres of operations. His wars were mainly local and not on a large scale. He slew Meredydd ap Madog ap Idnerth, and induced the followers of Meiric ap Madog ap Rhiryd to murder him—a method of war which was not uncommon in those ancient days. In the same battle described as a skirmish he took some captives, including Rhys ap Howel, and during their imprisonment he put out the eyes of Rhys—a form of cruelty inflicted on prisoners in olden times which indicated the barbarous nature of their warfare.

The Normans and Flemings did not abandon their warfare in South Wales after their great defeat on the Teivy in the year A.D. 1136 as described above. They then retired to their castles to renew their strength for future operations. In the year 1144 the sons of Owain Gwynedd, whose names were Howel and Cynan, marched into Caredigion, or Cardiganshire, and attacked the Normans and Flemings, and defeated them near Aberteivy, or Cardigan, and occupied and fortified the town. The northern army then returned to Gwynedd. There were then no standing armies in the modern sense of the term. The men were raised for a particular expedition and afterwards disbanded. In this expedition the men from Gwynedd did not advance beyond Caredigion. In the same year Gilbert, earl of Clare, invaded Dyved and seemed successful in his operations. He erected several castles, including that of the town of Caermarthen.

In the year 1146 or thereabout the brothers Cadell, Meredydd, and Rhys, and Howel ap Owain resolved to march an army into Dyfed and attack the Normans. This was an important portion of Deheubarth, or South Wales. The first of these brothers, Cadell, was recognised as the prince or king of South Wales, a kingdom largely broken into fragments after the defeat of Rhys ab Tewdwr in the year 1090. Since then the greater portion was in the occupation of the Normans. These confederated Welsh princes determined to rescue the country from the domination of the Normans. They gained possession of the castle of Dinevwr, the ancient capital of South Wales and sometimes giving its name to the kingdom. They besieged the castle of Caermarthen, which was surrendered, and the garrison allowed to depart. They defeated the Normans and the Flemings in the field and captured the castle of Llanstephan. The Welsh forces under Cadell and his brothers then retired homewards, but Llanstephan Castle was left in the military occupation of Meredydd. The Normans and their allies, when the Welsh army had retired, advanced against the castle of Llanstephan. They assaulted the place and used scaling ladders to obtain an entrance, but the assault failed and the Normans retired. In the following year, 1147, the three brothers commenced to act on the offensive against the Normans, and ventured to attack the castle of Gwys, but failed. Howel ap Owain was then invited to lead the British forces against the Normans. By employing a new method—the use of engines

of some description to cast large stones—he succeeded in capturing the castle of Gwys, the enemy giving way and surrendering the castle. The Welsh thus gained a measure of success, but they did not recover their lost territory in Dyfed. The Norman barons, owing to the disturbed condition of England, were left very much to themselves in Wales, and they seemed to be disunited, and sought mainly their individual ends, more like freebooters than warriors animated by the genuine military spirit—hence their loss of castles and territory. The Welsh fought bravely, and gained isolated victories, which they did not follow up and recover permanently the land they had lost.

Moreover, the Welsh were more divided among themselves than the Normans. If they had been united and well organised, they might during the disturbed reign of Stephen have succeeded in regaining their lost country and driving out the Normans from South Wales. About this time a quarrel arose between Cadwaladr, who then seemed to be in possession of Meirionydd, and his nephews Howel and Cynan, the sons of Owain Gwynedd. In the usual manner the nephews collected an army and led them into Meirionydd. They appealed to the people and promised many advantages if they submitted. The country was soon conquered. Even the castle of Cynvael,on the river Cynvael, which was held for Cadwaladr by an ecclesiastic, Mervyn, the abbot of Ty Gwyn, soon surrendered when the walls were stormed, though the abbot escaped. The war continued for some time—three or four years. Cadwaladr was taken a prisoner by Howel, who took possession of his territory. Thus, instead of combining their forces against the common foe, they wasted them in civil strife.

The war still went on in South Wales. Cadell ap Gruffydd, the late king of South Wales, seemed to have placed himself at the head of a movement directed against the Normans and the disturbers among the Welsh. He marched into the district of Cydweli after he had strengthened the castle of Caermyrddin. Then he advanced to Caredigion and gained a portion of the country, and completed the conquest in the following year, except a small portion. The fort of Ystrad Meirig was fortified afresh as a protection to the district. This campaign took place in the years 1152 and 1153. Cadell was joined in this movement by his brothers Meredydd and Rhys. The governing prince of Caredigion before this expedition was Howel ap Owain, who was then apparently too much engaged in the defence of Gwynedd against an attack of Ranulph, the earl of Chester, joined by Madog, prince of Powys. Cadell succeeded for the time in reconquering those parts of Dyfed which the Normans seemed to have safely secured, but he did not gain the affection of the inhabitants. He was probably an oppressor, and when Cadell was one day hunting, the men of Tenby attacked him and his attendants, and he escaped only with his life. It was suspected that the attack was the result of a conspiracy. The brothers of Cadell marched into Gower, or Gwyr, and ravaged the country and captured the castle of

Aberllychwr, and then returned to make the capital of South Wales, Dinevwr, safe against expected further attacks. In two years afterwards they marched and attacked Tenby by night, and scaled the walls of the castle before the Norman governor, Fitz-Gerald, was aware of their appoach. In returning home the brothers divided their forces and spoiled various places. In the year 1155 Meredydd died—poisoned, according to some accounts—and Cadell went on a pilgrimage to Rome, and hence disappeared from public view. His brother Rhys became the reigning prince of Dinevwr.

The reign of Stephen, marked by disorder in England and English feebleness in Wales, came to an end October 25, 1154. He was succeeded by Henry II., son of Maud, the disturber of the previous reign, and grandson of Henry I. His mother Maud was set aside from the throne by Stephen, but in 1153 she came to an arrangement with Stephen that her son Henry should succeed him. Maud married in A.D. 1130 Geoffrey Plantagenet, the earl of Anjou, in France, and Henry II. was their son. After the name of his father, he was called Henry Plantagenet, the first of the dynasty known in history as the Plantagenet dynasty, which continued until the Wars of the Roses in the fourteenth century. The reign of Henry II. witnessed a revival of the English efforts to conquer Wales, South and North. We will continue the narrative of the conflicts in South Wales. The Welsh princes as usual were divided, and warred against each other even at the beginning of the reign of Henry II. In the year 1158 a descendant of Jestyn Morganwg, previously described, Morgan ap Owain, was at war with the party of Ivor ap Meiric. In the war Morgan was slain and many of his followers, including Gwrgant ap Rhys. The result of this local war was that Iorwerth, the brother of Morgan, secured the lordship of Caerleon and the lands belonging thereto. In the year 1159, or thereabout, Henry II. commenced his military movements against the Welsh princes. Most of the minor princes submitted to his supremacy as the lord paramount, and peace was made between them. Rhys, the king or lord of South Wales, was not among them. He made preparations to oppose the king. However, he changed his mind and submitted to the summons of Henry to appear at his court. He was nominally king of Deheubarth, but the supremacy which once belonged to the position was gone, and the country was divided into independent or semi-independent lordships. Henry allowed Rhys to return home and to have as his province of government a large district designated in Welsh, Cantrev Mawr. This, under Henry II., was to be his lordship, not his kingdom. Henry, however, did not fulfil his promise, but assigned to Rhys petty manors separated from each other and difficult of defence in case of war.

Even this measure of power was interfered with by two Norman lords—Roger, earl of Clare, and Walter Clifford. Roger

marched into Caredigion and seized and fortified many castles, and Walter Clifford also invaded the dominion of Rhys and slew many inhabitants and carried off much booty. Rhys, receiving from Henry nothing but fair promises, determined to gain by war what peaceful means had failed to secure. In conjunction with his nephew Einion, the son of Anarawd, he commenced military operations in Caredigion, capturing castles and subduing the country. The year following, Rhys extended his operations and besieged the castle of Caervyrddin, but was unsuccessful. A combination of the forces went against him, consisting of the English under earl Rainold and the earl of Clare, and Welsh princes—Cadwaladr, the brother of the king of Gwynedd, and the two sons of the king, Howel and Cynan. In the presence of such forces Rhys abandoned the siege and retired to the mountains, and the campaign came to an end. The strange feature about this war was the part which the Welsh princes of North Wales took against their countryman, Rhys of South Wales. It is evidence of the usual division among them which has so often been pointed out. Rhys, then called the Lord Rhys, though obliged to abandon the siege of Caermarthen, did not cease to pursue his course of hostility against the king's representatives in South Wales. Henry II. in the year 1163 collected an army and proceeded against Rhys, marching along the coast of Morganwg and Gower without meeting any opposition, and reached Caervyrddin. Rhys had retired to Pencadair, and feeling that he could not resist the organised forces which Henry had brought against him, agreed to surrender, did homage to the king, and gave hostages for his future good behaviour. He was, however, confirmed in his possessions in South Wales. The king, having gained but little by his expedition, returned to England. The country was in a disturbed state, and much crime prevailed. Einion, the son of the late Anarawd, was murdered by Walter ap Llywarch, and Cadwgan ap Meredydd by Walter ap Richard. Such a condition of things was the result of war and civil discord and personal malice on the part of the princes themselves. Nominally now South Wales was under the sovereignty of the king of England, the native princes outside the Norman lordships doing homage and thus confessing their subjection.

The great lord, Rhys ap Gruffydd, did not, however, settle down to a quiet life in the enjoyment of his lands and territory as agreed upon by himself and King Henry. Princes in those days, Norman and British, had much of the freebooter's spirit in their character and methods of operation. Rhys attacked the possessions of the earl of Clare and took much booty. He succeeded in capturing castle after castle, and brought the whole of Caredigion under his power. He directed his forces also against the Flemings, who were a peaceful and industrious people. The example of Rhys induced the Welsh princes and people to make another attempt to drive out the invaders and regain the independence of Wales. Henry was engaged in the struggle

with the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, and the opportunity was taken by the Welsh princes to assert their independence. The Welsh people did not take any interest in the contest between Henry and the priest, and the matter does not claim our special attention in presenting the narrative of Welsh history, except to note the fact. The people of Wales in the twelfth century, like other peoples, were superstitious enough, and might possibly have some sympathy with the priest against the king whom they had no reason to love; but they were cut off largely from England by political and racial causes. The king was towards the Welsh very cruel, as was shown by his shocking conduct to the hostages of the Welsh princes, twenty-two of whom he blinded and mutilated from rage against the confederated princes of Wales, which will be described further on when we come to consider the wars of North Wales.

Rhys advanced to Aberteivy, or Cardigan, and took the castle and destroyed it, but he allowed the garrison and the people to leave and carry with them a portion of their property. The governor of the place, Robert Fitz-Stephen, he held as a prisoner. In this expedition Rhys also captured and destroyed the castle of Cilgarran. In the following year, probably 1166, under the direction of Henry and aided by Norman troops, the Flemings of Roose retaliated against Rhys and ravaged Caredigion, killing many persons and robbing others. They attempted to capture the strong castle of Cilgarran, but failed. Internal conflicts are often closely mixed up with foreign ones. About this time, A.D. 1166, an incident is variously narrated that Owain Cyveiliog and Owain Vychan attacked Iorwerth Goch, seized his lands and divided them. In the following year, however, Owain Gwynedd of North Wales and Rhys of South Wales interfered, and drove Owain Cyveiliog from his possessions over the English border. Another version is given varying the narrative. We mention it here to indicate the discords and conflicts among the Welsh princes themselves alongside with foreign dangers.

In the year 1171 there was in South Wales a general peace between the Welsh princes and Henry. In this year Henry II. proceeded to Ireland for the purpose of conquering the country, and in the following year, 1172, succeeded in his expedition. The pope of Rome, Adrian IV., by a bull published in the year 1156, had given authority for the conquest of Ireland. In those days popes claimed the right of determining the destinies of nations and the persons who should reign over them. The Irish were then under the government of different princes and a multitude of minor rulers, heads of tribes and clans, possessing no real national unity and organic national administration. There were many kings and rulers, who usually fought against each other and created disorder. This had been the case from the earliest times. Thus, divided like the Welsh, they became the prey of the foreign invader who possessed more power and unity. In the year 1166 Dermot MacMurrough, then king of Leinster, was

driven from his throne because of his vices, and fled to England; and in 1168 he took the oath of fidelity to Henry II. on the condition of his restoration to the throne. In the year 1169 the earl of Pembroke's son, known under the designation of Strongbow, was placed at the head of an English army, which invaded Ireland and partially reduced the country, which came to be known as the Pale, and included the present counties of Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare. The landing of Strongbow was at Waterford. In the year 1171 Dermot died. The success of the English troops under Strongbow and others was much aided by the mutual jealousies and strifes of the native chiefs. "In the twelfth century Ireland was divided into five kingdoms—viz., Ulster, Leinster, Meath, Connaught, and Munster—besides a number of petty principalities whose sovereigns continually warred with each other." Henry himself landed near Waterford, and soon received the submission of the native princes and settled the government, so that in 1172 the historian records that Ireland was conquered.

In Henry's way to Ireland he passed through South Wales. The lord of Dinevwr, Prince Rhys, met him on the border and submitted to him as the supreme, the lord paramount. The result was that Henry confirmed him in his territories and possessions, and in accordance with the customs of the age, Rhys gave Henry fourteen hostages, and promised him four hundred head of cattle and three hundred horses, the signs of his fealty. At the place called Penbroch, or Pembroke, the king gave to Rhys a more formal grant of Caredigion and the districts of Stratywy, Arwystli, and Elvel. Later on in the year Rhys came from Aberteivy, or Cardigan, which he had rebuilt after its destruction, to Penbroch, or Pembroke, and personally presented to Henry a portion of the promised number of horses. Henry accepted only a part, and sent the remainder back in a gracious manner. At the same time Henry went to St. David's, made offerings, and dined with the bishop. This monarch, noted for his licentious conduct and the number of his illegitimate children, could try to atone for his sins by such conduct. Henry also had a conference with Strongbow, who had come from Ireland for the purpose. Then Henry returned to Pembroke strong castle, called then Penbroch, or Pen-Bro, the head of the land. This Strongbow was the son of the earl of Pembroke, and was described as Richard de Clare of Strigul, or Chepstow. He was not the only warrior engaged by Dermot. There were also Robert Fitz-Stephen and Maurice Fitz-Gerald.

Henry, during his stay in South Wales, evidently desired to conciliate the greatest Welsh prince, Rhys, the lord of Dynevwr, or in full, Rhys ap Gruffydd. He made a visit to the celebrated White House on the Tav, where the assembly of great men representing all Wales were gathered to frame the ancient laws of Wales under Howel Dda in the tenth century. When there, Henry remitted for the present the tribute due from Rhys, and

restored Howel, the son of Rhys, who had been given as one of the hostages. After the conquest and settlement of Ireland, Henry returned to South Wales. Rhys met him again at Talacharn and renewed his friendship. This was early in the year 1172. Henry showed his confidence in Rhys by appointing him to the important office of Chief Justiciary for South Wales. This office made Rhys the representative of the king. In England the chief justiciary was the regent when the king was absent from the country. When at Cardiff, he summoned Iorwerth and his sons to meet him and account for their recent conduct. This Iorwerth ab Owain was the lord of Caerleon-upon-Usk. Henry, on his way through South Wales to Ireland, had deprived Iorwerth of his lordship. This, of course, was displeasing to the Welsh lord, and when Henry had departed he and his two sons—Howel and Owain—and his nephew Morgan ap Seisyllt rose in rebellion and took and destroyed Caerleon except the castle. To account for this conduct Henry summoned Iorwerth and his sons to him and gave them a safe conduct. Iorwerth proceeded towards the king and ordered his son Owain to follow him. In his journey Owain was attacked and slain by the men of the earl of Bristow in ignorance of the king's safe conduct. On learning of this murder contrary to the king's safe conduct, Iorwerth turned back and organised an expedition for reprisals, asserting that he would never again believe the word of an Englishman. In this expedition he wasted the country as far as the walls of Gloucester and Hereford. Henry desired to secure peace through South Wales, and imagined he had done so, but through misunderstandings or old animosities war broke out in some districts.

The province of Gwent, embracing Monmouthshire, was at this time under the government of Ranulph Poer, the vice-count of Gloucester. He was a cruel tyrant, and was detested by the Welsh as the representative of the English king and government. A combination of Welshmen was formed to deliver the district from the domination of the English. The leaders were Seisyllt ap Dyvnwal and Ieuan ab Seisyllt ap Rhyrid. The intention was to begin the war by capturing the castle of Abergavenny by night. The attack was made at the early dawn when the guard had retired to rest. The constable, his wife, and most of the soldiers were made prisoners, and the castle was set on fire. This occurred in the end of the year 1172. This clever capture did not, however, result in the conquest of the whole of Gwent, and three years afterwards the castle came into the possession of the English. The lord-governor of the castle, Ranulph Poer, was absent when the castle was taken, and some time afterwards, when engaged in the erection of another castle in Gwent, he and his guard of men were attacked and slain.

The lord Rhys of South Wales continued to be faithful to Henry during this period, and even sent many of his light-armed troops to his aid when the war broke out between him and his sons, who were aided by the French king. They went over to Normandy,

and were of great value to Henry in raising the siege of Rouen and in wasting the territory of the French king. Notwithstanding the fidelity of Rhys, some of the minor Welsh princes continued local wars. Iorwerth ab Owain again rose in arms, and aided by his son Howel, succeeded in capturing the town and castle of Caerleon and subduing Gwent Iscoed, with the exception of one castle. This conquest was of short duration, for a strong force of Normans and English appeared before Caerleon and captured the town and castle.

The small risings of British princes in particular districts could not much delay the conquest or the submission of South Wales. In the year 1175 or 1176, Henry II. held a court at Gloucester, and probably summoned his vassals to appear before him. The chief prince of South Wales, Rhys ap Gruffydd, managed to induce all the Welsh princes of South Wales—then called in Latin *Reguli*, or minor subordinate rulers—to accompany him to Gloucester to appear before the great English king, and to do homage to him as the lord paramount, and to obtain his pardon for any acts of rebellion. They included Cadwallwn ap Madog of Maleinydd, Einion ab Rhys of Gwarthrynion, Einion Glyd of Elvel, Morgan ab Caradog of Morganwg, Gruffydd ab Ivor of Senghenydd, Seisyllt ab Dyvnwal of Higher Gwent, and Iorwerth ab Owain of Caerleon. The result of this interview and submission to the supreme monarch was favourable. Past offences were forgiven, and peace was established. Iorwerth was restored to his lordship of Caerleon. Both parties were pleased—the king and the Welsh princes. The final order of the king was that if any Welshman made war against another or against the king, the other princes were bound to defend the one attacked. The final result of the arrangement made at Gloucester was the pacification of South Wales. In the following year another court or royal council was held at Oxford, when many Welsh princes appeared not only from South but also from North Wales, and renewed their homage to the English monarch.

In the year A.D. 1178, Rhys of South Wales made a great feast for the nobles of South Wales at Cardigan, or Aberteivy. The feast, after the Welsh customs, was marked by contests in poetry and song, in which the bards were the chief performers. Everything seemed pacific between Henry and the Welsh and between the princes themselves; but in a country governed by many subordinate rulers without any effective national unity, there was no certain guarantee against local wars. Shortly after this, through some disagreement, the two princes previously mentioned—Einion Glyd and Morgan ab Meredydd—were slain by the Normans or English. A Welshman of the name of Cadwallwn—not the one of the same name lately mentioned—was also murdered. These are illustrations of the unsettled condition of national life when there was professed peace between the different powers. A single incident may be mentioned to show how easily a war might arise, even among the Welsh princes themselves. The lord of South

Wales, Rhys, had constructed a castle somewhere on the upper part of the Wye called Rhaiadrgwy ; and this gave offence to the princes of North Wales and the sons of Cynan ap Owain. Gwynedd commenced a war against him on this account. Possibly the castle was on territory claimed by the king of North Wales. In the year 1184 King Henry, incensed against the Welsh of South Wales because of the assassination of Ranulph Poer in Monmouthshire, assembled an army at Worcester with the view of invading South Wales. Rhys of South Wales, however, met him and renewed his oaths of submission, and pacified the king by his explanations and promises. There can be no doubt that Rhys himself was pacific and sincere in his professions of loyalty to the king, but he had a difficulty in keeping all his vassals and subordinate rulers in order. It was an age of local wars and of barbarous conduct. Men denominated heroes were often not much more than marauders and robbers on both sides. Within the next three years—1184–7—Cadwaladr ab Rhys was slain and interred in the noted Ty Gwyn ; and Owain Vychan ab Madog was murdered by the sons of Owain Cyveiliog ; and Llewelyn ab Cadwallwn was imprisoned, and had his eyes taken out by his own brother. These are terrible illustrations of the cruelty that prevailed even among the Welsh themselves in the twelfth century. The great king Henry II. died in the year 1189 without having completed the conquest of Wales. He had succeeded to a large extent in pacifying South Wales and securing everywhere the recognition of his supremacy. In all probability if he had been free from domestic trouble, and from the conflict with the Church in the person of Thomas à Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury, he would have accomplished his purpose. He was a great monarch, but he lived in an age of superstition, when "the Church" claimed supremacy over the State. And even the powerful Henry had to bend to that superstition, and make a pilgrimage to the tomb of the "martyr," endured penance, remained a whole day and watched a whole night over the ashes and relics of the saint.

Henry II. was succeeded on the throne by his son Richard I., a man very different from his father, whom he had rebelled against during his life. He, however, repented of his conduct towards his father, and confirmed in office the same ministers of state. He soon liberated from prison his mother Eleanor, who had been confined in prison by her husband Henry II. through his attachment to other women, especially one. Richard I. reigned only ten years—1189–1199—the greater part of which he devoted to the Crusades, the deliverance of Jerusalem from the Saracens, probably more from a desire for military glory than from a superstitious regard for religion. The Crusades were in that age a rage of Europe, and even Baldwin, the archbishop of Canterbury, visited Wales to preach the Crusades. Some Welshmen did take part in the movement, but the mania was not as great among the Welsh as the English and some European countries.

During the reign of Richard I. the Welsh were not much disturbed by the English, who were otherwise engaged ; and if the Britons had been a united people under one controlling government, they might probably have secured their independence during this reign and that of John. In the early part of Richard's reign the lord of South Wales was led to have an interview at Oxford with the new king of England. It was said that he was refused the required interview for some reason or other—according to the opinion of some persons, because he had refused to take any part in the Crusade against the Saracens on which the king was bent. The true reason of the refusal is not certainly known. The account states that the aged prince returned home in anger, and began a war against the possessions of the king in South Wales. His course was marked by the usual plundering and burning, and by the capture of castles in the district called Dyved, but soon lost them again. The actual dates of these events are uncertain. These wars were not of much importance except to the Norman-English representatives of the king in Wales. In the closing years of the twelfth century several local contests are recorded carried on by the sons of Lord Rhys, especially by Howel, who was called *Sais*, or the Englishman, because at one time he had been in the military service in England. Castles were taken and retaken. There was not any cordial friendship even in the family of Rhys. Anarawd made prisoners of his brothers Howel and Madog, and made them blind when in prison, but they were afterwards released by another son, Maelgwn ; but the accounts are not consistent. Rhys himself was made a prisoner by his own sons, and his capital of Dynevwr was occupied by Maelgwn. He, however, escaped from prison and retook his capital. The accounts of these events are confused, and the dates uncertain, but they indicate the sad want of unity among the Welsh princes and people.

In 1195 or 1196 Roger Mortimer led an expedition into the district of Maelionydd, fortified the castle of Cymaran, and subdued the country. The Flemings also soon after took the castle of Wyg or Gwys. The castle of St. Clare was taken by William de Breos and the retainers of Howel. Rhys himself burnt Caervyrddin, and afterwards led his army towards Hereford, and on his way burnt Radnor, killing the knights of Roger Mortimer then in the occupation of the place. William de Breos, in the absence of Rhys, captured the town of Abertawy, or Swansea. Rhys also attacked and captured the castle of Clun. The full accounts of these efforts are confusing and much coloured, and some are fictitious.

In the year A.D. 1197 the old prince or king of South Wales, Rhys ap Gruffydd, died and was interred in St. David's cathedral. His praises were sung by the bards in the usual extravagant style of ancient poetry, comparing him with Hercules, Achilles, Nestor, Samson, Solomon, and others. The greatness of this prince was unquestionable, and during his long reign he conducted the affairs

of his dominion, in council and on the battlefield, with astonishing ability and success.

Rhys had several children—some dead and some alive. The younger son, Gruffydd ab Rhys, ascended the throne by his own will. The son whose name was Maelgwn was regarded as disinherited on account of his conduct. Gruffydd proceeded to the court of England and obtained from the king, who was the supreme power, a confirmation of the possessions of his father, whose legitimate successor he was. Although allowed to ascend to power quietly, in a few months, in the following August, Maelgwn rose against him, probably aided by the ruler of Cyveiliog, whose name was Gwenwynwyn. Maelgwn was very energetic in raising and organising an army, and hurriedly marched against his brother, who was then at Aberystwith. His arrival was unexpected, and he soon succeeded in capturing the place and the castle, slaying many of the troops of Gruffydd, and taking him as a prisoner. He placed Gruffydd as a prisoner in the charge of Gwenwynwyn, who transferred him to the English as a prisoner of war. Two brothers, sons of Rhys—namely Rhys and Meredydd—who had been imprisoned by their father, were now set at liberty by Maelgwn. The new ruler advanced through the country, captured the castles of Cardigan and Ystrad-Meirig, and gained possession of the whole of Caredigion. The Normans had got into possession of Dinevwr, but they were soon dispossessed by one of the brothers of Maelgwn.

The ruler of Cyveiliog—a small district in Montgomeryshire—Gwenwynwyn—conquered Arwystli. His father died in this year, who was designated Owain Cyveiliog, and was the prince of Southern Powys, of which Cyveiliog was a part. The son then succeeded to the dominion of his father, and henceforth this portion of Powys bore his name, Powys Gwenwynwyn. About this time—the end of 1197—an incident is related which showed the spirit of Norman rule in South Wales. A man of considerable power in Brycheiniog, named Trahaiarn Vychan, was proceeding to Llangors to have an interview with William de Breos, the lord marcher, when he was seized by the order of the lord marcher, fastened to the tail of a horse, dragged through Brecknock town to a gallows, where he was beheaded, and his body hung up by the feet for three days. The prince of Powys Gwenwynwyn, cousin of the murdered man, endeavoured in the following year, 1198, to avenge the foul deed, but was unsuccessful.

Gruffydd ap Rhys was now released from prison, and entered upon a campaign against his brother Maelgwn to recover the possession of his dominion. He was successful, and gained all except the castles of Cardigan and Ystrad-Meirig, which were held by Maelgwn. Some nobles of South Wales attempted to make peace between the brothers. They thought they had succeeded, but Maelgwn broke his promise and acted treacherously. He captured the castle of Dinerth, and put the men who garrisoned it for Gruffydd to death. The castle of Cilgarran was gained and

fortified by Gruffydd. The war continued for some time with various fluctuations, but Gruffydd died in the year 1201. The war was continued by Maelgwn and other relations, Rhys ap Gruffydd, and others—castles being taken and retaken. Maelgwn gained the greatest advantages, and was said to bear the rule of South Wales, but only on a reduced scale, other princes holding strong positions. The restless Maelgwn continued his warlike career for many years against his countrymen, and sometimes in alliance with the Norman-English, and was able to maintain his supremacy in South Wales over the Welsh princes. His career, however, came to an end in the year 1230 A.D., and was succeeded by his son Maelgwn Vychan, or Little.

During the progress of the internal war just described, the English barons were not idle in South Wales. King Richard I. died in the year 1199 after a reign of nearly ten years and in the forty-second year of his age. He was of an impetuous spirit, and had great personal courage, and delighted in military glory. He was called the Lion-Hearted—*cœur de lion*. His reign, nevertheless, was inglorious. He was succeeded by his youngest brother, John, the fifth son of Henry II. He reigned from 1199 to 1216. William Marshall was made the earl of Pembroke and Hubert de Burgh warden of the March. It is said that Howel *Sais* went at once to the court of John, and on his return died of disease or slain by the Normans. The place of his death was Strigul, known to us as Chepstow, where one of the strong castles erected during the reign of William the Conqueror existed, whose ruins are so well known. Another account describes his death as later, in 1205, and at a different place. The reign of John, as is well known, was marked by the contest between him and his barons, which ended in the obtaining from him the Magna Charta, the foundation of English constitutional rights ; and also the contest between him and the pope, which ended so ingloriously for the king. These contests occupied the attention of the king, and gave South Wales comparative freedom from English aggression.

The internal conflicts continued in South Wales. Rhys ap Gruffydd pursued his military career ; he gained and strengthened the castle of Llangadoc and others ; but Maelgwn retook them, and at the same time completed the strong castle of Dinerth. The earl of Pembroke appeared on the scene, and took the castle of Cilgarran. Maelgwn employed an Irishman to murder Cadivor ap Gruffydd ; he himself had slain the four sons of Cadivor. This was about the year 1204, and in the following year Rhys Vychan, aided by the Normans, burnt the castle of Luche Owain, and slew the garrison. Such was the barbarous kind of war then carried on, and such was the mixture of parties in South Wales. In the midst of such dreadful wars the historians could turn aside and record that in 1189 there was a great famine and mortality ; in the year 1197 great sterility and plague ; in 1201 there were great and destructive rains in the month of August ; the harvest of corn was spoiled, the fruits did not ripen, and many sheep and cattle died.

The winter following was very severe : the frost continued till the middle of March, cattle and sheep perished in large numbers, oats and barley were nearly destroyed ; but there was an alleviation of suffering in a good wheat harvest and abundance of fish.

This was an age of superstition in Wales and everywhere else. An instance, as recorded, may be given here. William de Breos had taken part in the wars in France ; he was made a prisoner, but liberated by King John, who took the side against Arthur, duke of Britagne, and De Breos for him. In 1201 John demanded his sons as hostages for good behaviour. The wife of De Breos, whose name was Maud de St. Valeri, refused. De Breos was banished by King John and his possessions forfeited. He, his wife, and sons fled to Ireland. His wife had in Wales the reputation of being a great witch. She was reported to have built the castle of Hay in Brecknockshire in *one night*, carrying the stones in her own apron. Other wonderful things were related of her. Two years after she and her sons were captured by John and were imprisoned in Windsor Castle, where they died of starvation. De Breos himself fled to France, and died a few years afterwards in miserable circumstances. Thus even Norman barons who gave themselves to war were treated in those cruel times.

Maelgwn on prudential grounds about this time—1209–1210—went to and did homage at the court of King John. On his return he brought many Normans and Englishmen with him, and collected an army of Welshmen who united with these strangers. He then began to devastate the lands of his Welsh enemies, Rhys and Owain, violating his oath to them. The two princes thus attacked raised a body of men, some three hundred strong, and pitching their camp near to that of Maelgwn, they attacked it by night and dispersed the camp and army ; but his nephew, Cynan ab Howel, and his chief counsellor, Gruffydd ab Cadwgan, were made prisoners, and many of his men were slain.

The conflicts described above were between Britons themselves. Now and then local battles between Britons and the Norman-English broke out about this time—1209–10. Gilbert, earl of Gloucester, one of the lord marchers, fortified the castle of Builth in preparation for further battles. He had lost a little before this time many men at this place. Robert Fitz-Richard, in battles with the Welsh, lost the castle of Haverfordwest and his whole barony, and he died in the next year, 1211.

About this time the vice-count of Cardiff was a man whose name was Fulk ; he was a cruel and tyrannical man, but he was beloved by King John. He was ordered by the king to join Maelgwn and Rhys Vychan for the purpose of overcoming the two rebel princes of South Wales, Rhys and Owain, whose chief estate was Cantrev Penwedic. The rebel princes, however, went to King John and submitted to his authority. They were well received, and returned safely to Wales. The region which was the scene of operations was soon conquered by Fulk, who fortified and garrisoned the castle of Aberystwith in the interest of John. The war was not.

however, ended. Maelgwn and Rhys Vychan, who had previously made peace with John and had given hostages for their good behaviour in the persons of their sons, repented and broke the peace. They attacked and captured and burnt the castle of Aberystwith, and destroyed the king's garrison, which Fulk had only recently placed there. The war was extended farther into South Wales. On hearing of this outbreak, King John was very angry, and retaliated by mutilating the young hostages, from which the son of Maelgwn died. Such was the barbarous cruelty of the times. This state of things led the young princes, Rhys and Owain, to recommence operations and ravage the lands of Maelgwn and to slay his men, including a youth named Bach Glas, who was regarded as a young man of great strength and bravery. This expedition was a marauding one, and the leaders and men returned with much booty. Many of those wars were local, and were intended to grab the land of enemies and to steal their movable property. In the execution of these purposes, the princes on all sides did not appear in a favourable light.

The greed and self-seeking of the native princes mentioned in the narrative may be judged from this fact. The rightful heir to the late Lord Rhys de Gruffydd was Rhys ab Gruffydd ab Rhys, and he was deprived of his rights and his lands by his uncles, Maelgwn and Rhys Vychan. He complained to King John, who ordered Fulk, who was the warden of the Marches and steward of Hereford, to aid the young prince and to restore to him the lands of Llanymddyvri. He conveyed to Rhys Vychan his orders, and informed him that he would lose all Ystrad Tywy unless he surrendered the territory mentioned to his nephews. Rhys ab Gruffydd was acting for himself and his brother Owain. The answer of Rhys Vychan was that he would not surrender a single foot. This led to war. Fulk gathered his men, and young Rhys raised his forces in Brycheiniog. The united forces advanced in three divisions under Fulk, Rhys, and Owain against Rhys Vychan, who was in the possession of the territory demanded. They completely defeated Rhys Vychan, and then marching to the capital, Dynevwr, assaulted and captured it. The whole country called Cantrev Mawr was subdued, and the territory of Llanymddyvri was restored to the young princes. This took place in the year 1213 or 1214.

The success of the young princes led to their reconciliation with their uncle, Maelgwn, and their forces were united for the conquest of Dyved from the Normans. At this time (1214) King John was engaged in a war with France, and the Bishop of Hereford, who was a son of William de Breos, took an active part in organising the discontented barons against him in conjunction with the Welsh. Bishops in those days were often princes or territorial lords, and took part in the intrigues and wars of other princes. This confederacy resulted, so far as Wales was concerned, in the capture of the castles and lands then held by the officers of the king. The bishop, Giles de Breos, and his brother Reginald led

their forces into Wales, and captured the castles in Breconshire and Radnorshire, including those of Payne and Clun, and the territory of Elvel. The bishop was lord of this district. Thus the Welsh had succeeded in Dyved and in the districts adjoining England. The Normans, or Franks as they were then called, were not subdued in South Wales, and in revenge for the plundering by the Welsh in Dyved, they proceeded against Caervyrddin and burned the town then in the occupation of the Welsh. In the early part of December of this year the Welsh princes of North and South Wales combined and marched against Caervyrddin, now occupied by the Normans, and captured and destroyed the castle. They also succeeded in destroying other Norman castles, including those of Cydweli, Llanstephan, Emlyn, and others. And about Christmas, crossing the Teivi, they gained possession of Aberteivi, or Cardigan, and Cilgarran. Having gained these successes over the Norman barons in South Wales, the confederated princes, who included Llewelyn, broke up and returned home. It is supposed by some writers that these victories were in the interest of King John against the barons.

It is obvious from the above narrative that in South Wales there was much confusion among the native princes and many disputes about claims to lands and power. The prince of North Wales, Llewelyn ab Iorwerth, who was recognised in some sense as overlord, proceeded to South Wales in the year 1215 for the purpose of settling the disputes among the princes descended from the Lord Rhys, acting as an arbitrator between them. He opened his court at Aberteivi, or Cardigan. He seems to have succeeded by giving proportionate cantrevs to the princes, Maelgwn, young Rhys and his brother Owain, and Rhys Vychan. There is, however, some doubt about this settlement by Llewelyn but the probability is in favour of his services.

King John was placed in difficulties by the ill-success of his foreign enterprises and the demands of the barons. Under these circumstances he retired to Wales in July, 1215, and sought the assistance of Llewelyn and the lord of Hereford, Reginald de Breos, brother and successor of the late militant bishop and lord. This appeal was made from Hereford towards the end of July. The response was not favourable to John. From Hereford the king advanced to South Wales and occupied the town and castle of Hay. From this place he announced to the Welsh princes and people that he came among them as a friend and not as an enemy. His appeal had no effect on the people of South Wales. Then in disappointment he burnt the castle to the ground. The castle of Radnor shared the same fate on the 2nd of August, and the Clun Castle on the 3rd of August. The king advanced from the south towards the north and arrived at Oswestry, near North Wales, and sent for Llywelyn to come to him, but in vain. The king burnt Oswestry and retired ; and after remaining on the border ten days, he left. The barons of the Marches and the Welsh princes took the side of the enemies of John and got from him the grant of

Magna Charta. The legate of the pope placed Wales under the interdict because its princes aided the English barons in their opposition to the king.

King John died on the 17th of October, 1216, after an inglorious reign of seventeen years. He was succeeded by his son, Henry III., who reigned from 1216 to 1272. The young king was for some time placed in charge of the earl of Pembroke, who was marshal of England, and in certain circumstances was head of the army and government. Soon after John's death the earl conveyed young Henry, then only nine years of ages, to Gloucester, where, on the 28th of October, 1216, the ceremony of his coronation took place. In those superstitious times the approval of the pope was necessary, and Henry, though only a boy, had to swear fealty to him. Henry was, of course, too young to reign in person, and the duty devolved on the marshal, the earl of Pembroke. This authority was given to him formally by a general council of the barons summoned to meet at Bristol, who legally constituted him protector of the nation. The earl renewed and confirmed the Great Charter with some modifications. Thus began the important reign of Henry III.

The barons of England were now, of course, reconciled to the English monarch through the skilful management of the earl of Pembroke, but the agreement made did not include the Welsh princes. The war consequently continued in Wales. Reginald de Breos, the lord of the district, was attacked by the Welsh princes, Rhys and Owain of South Wales and Llewelyn of North Wales. The district of Builth was captured by the young princes and the castle seriously damaged. Llewelyn marched later in the same year, 1217, into Breconshire, and afterwards to Gower and Dyved, and carried all before him. The Flemings of Dyved desired peace from him, and afterwards obtained it, with difficulty, through the bishop of St. David, whose name was Iorweth, on hard terms, namely a money indemnity, twenty hostages, and fealty to Llewelyn as their liege lord. Llewelyn then returned to North Wales. The war was not over in other parts of South Wales. Rhys Vychan destroyed all the castles in his custody, and drove the English from his lands and divided them among the Welsh. In 1218 Llewelyn garrisoned the castles of Cardigan and Caermarthen, but young Rhys went to the English king and did homage for the lands, thus acknowledging the supremacy of the English monarch. These facts indicate a curious state of things: the English barons defeated and expelled, and yet the overlordship of the king of England acknowledged. The disputes were not yet settled between the king and the Welsh. In a short time after Llewelyn returned, he was summoned by Henry to appear at Worcester on the 11th of March, 1219, to do homage to the king. He obeyed the order and attended, and swore over the sacred relics to restore the castles of Cardigan and Caermarthen and the lands to the representatives of the king, and all the other lands and castles belonging to the king's partisans; and to induce all

the Welsh princes to do homage to the king. Llewelyn apparently fulfilled his promise, and the Welsh princes were summoned to appear at Gloucester to do homage to the king. In March, 1219, the earl marshal and actual ruler, the earl of Pembroke, died, and the bishop of Winchester and Hubert de Burgh were constituted the guardians of the young king. The policy of the English government continued the same, namely, to induce all the Welsh princes to submit to the supremacy of the king and to hold their authority and lands under him as their lord and over-king. In Wales at this time Llewelyn had attained to supremacy among the Welsh princes, but he acknowledged the English king as supreme. This arrangement was often broken; disputes and wars followed. In this way Wales was continually in an unsettled condition.

In the year 1226 the bailiff, or custodian, of Cardigan and Caermarthen Castles for the king was William Marshall, the young Earl of Pembroke; but having displeased the king, he was deprived of the position. As usual, this so displeased the young earl that shortly after he joined the barons, who were insurgents against the king. The state of the country was unsettled, and much crime and plundering prevailed. Cattle and sheep were stolen and houses burnt down, men were slain, and even towns were destroyed. This continued in South Wales for several years. The earl of Pembroke, however, died in the year 1231; but in the same year the Welsh invaded the Marches again with much energy. The Welsh prince, Maelgwn, son of Rhys, who had been a very active and even restless man, and for many years the lord of Dynevwr, or South Wales, died in the year 1230, and was succeeded in his dominion by his son Maelgwn Vychan, or the Little, equivalent to the modern, Maelgwn, Junior. Llewelyn of North Wales, enraged at the cruel conduct of the Justiciary of Henry in slaying prisoners handed over to him, about this time began another war against the representatives of Henry, the lord marchers. He, in the usual manner of the times, laid waste the country, destroying even churches and priests. His army invaded South Wales. He devasted Brycheiniog, the modern Breconshire, and burnt the capital, but could not take the castle. He invaded Gwent and conquered the lords of South Wales, except Morgan ab Howell, who occupied the castle of Caerleon though the town was burnt. The town of Neath was destroyed and many of its inhabitants slain. Then he advanced and conquered Cardigan and Cydweli. Maelgwn Vychan is described as engaging in a raid about the same time, but probably it was part of the great movement led by Llewelyn. Henry, on hearing of Llewelyn's expedition, gathered an army and assembled his nobility and leading Churchmen at Oxford; he ordered Llewelyn and his associates to be excommunicated; then he advanced to Hereford, and from there he sent to the vice-count of Gloucester to supply his army with food and artificers. Henry's expedition was only partially successful, and a truce was soon made and renewed between

Henry and his enemies—Llewelyn and his allies. This campaign was in the year 1233.

Soon after this Richard, earl marshal, offended with Henry in London, hastened to Wales, and being joined by other discontented nobles, began a war against the king in South Wales. Henry gathered an army consisting of English and also Flemings and Frenchmen and advanced to Hereford. He invited Llewelyn to meet him to establish a firm peace. Llewelyn made excuses and did not accept the invitation. The war in South Wales began and Richard, earl marshal, advanced against St. David's, then held by the king's representative. He was joined by several Welsh princes—Owain, Maelgwn, and Rhys Gryg. The town was taken and burnt, and many of the king's partisans were slain. Then the confederates proceeded against Cardiff, Pencelly, Abergavenny, and other strong places, and conquered them and ravaged the lands. The earl marshal also besieged the castle of Caermarthen. From Hereford the king's army advanced against the territory of the earl marshal. No real success attended the king's army, and by arrangement the king retired. He returned to Gloucester, but whilst there he was mortified by losses at the castles of Grosmont and Hereford. The state of things was peculiar ; for whilst the earl marshal and his Welsh allies attacked the castles and the lands held by the king's representatives, the earl abstained from attacking the king himself, whom he regarded as his supreme lord. The great Llewelyn also joined the earl marshal, and their combined forces ravaged the English territory on the borders, and extended their conquests from Monmouth to Shrewsbury. The latter important town they burnt down. The king himself remained during this time at Gloucester. He was then unable to pursue his Welsh enemies, being without an army of sufficient strength. He then retired, but the war in Wales and on the borders went on in the old fashion. This was in the early part of 1234. Richard, the earl marshal, was called over to Ireland to put down the war against him, and there he lost his life. Henry dismissed his ministers of state, the bishop of Winchester, and others ; and the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of Chester and Rochester were sent as an embassy to Wales to make peace. A conditional peace was made. In May of the same year the Welsh chiefs were summoned to Gloucester ; peace was agreed upon ; the brother of the late earl marshal attended, whose name was Gilbert, and received the inheritance of his brother, and did homage to the king. Henry sent a letter to Llewelyn, and a truce was arranged for two years. In this year, 1234, Rhys Gryg died at Llandeilo Vawr and was interred at St. David's ; also Cadwallwn ab Maelgwn. The year was also one of famine and dearth —one of special misery to the people—produced by bad government, war, and storms. The truce between Llewelyn and the king expired in 1236, but was renewed for another year on condition that the castle of Caerleon should be restored to Morgan, who had been improperly deprived during the truce.

In the year 1242 Maelgwn Vychan, of South Wales, fortified the castle of Garthgrugyn, and the castle of Builth was also strengthened by John of Monmouth. In the same year the king is described as again troubling the Welsh and taking their lands. In 1244 the prince Rhys Vychan died, and Gruffydd, the brother of Davydd, was killed in attempting to escape from the Tower of London. This led to another war between the Welsh and the English on the Marches. Davydd, the son of Llewelyn the Great, had succeeded his father as prince of North Wales on the death of the latter, the 11th of April, 1240; and proposed to avenge the death of his brother Gruffydd, to whom, however, he had not been very brotherly during his life. The war continued for a short time. There was much confusion in the affairs of South Wales, which was divided between a number of princes and lords without any head of any importance. Some parts were occupied and governed by native Welsh princes; but other districts, called the Marches, were held by Norman-English lords in the name of the king, though sometimes they acted as independent. In 1247 it is recorded that Rhys Vychan ab Rhys Mechyl captured from the English the strong castle of Carreg Cennen. In the year 1257 several Welsh chieftains combined and captured the abbey of Ty Gwyn, the noted place where the great council met and formed the codes of law in the tenth century known as the Ancient Laws of Wales. This excited the anger of the King of North Wales, who invaded the south and punished the chiefs and subjected to himself all the Britons of the district, and also ravaged the country in the possession of the English. The Welsh seemed to gain more power and territory, although sometimes at war with themselves. Sometimes they were found in the armies of the English fighting against their countrymen. Such was the case in the army led by Stephen Bauzan, which occupied Caermarthen in this year and laid waste the district of Ystrad Tywy and Llandeilo Vawr. The Welshmen of Cardigan and of the district invaded marched against them under Meredydd ab Rhys and in a severe battle defeated them, slaying over three thousand, including Stephen, their commander. The Welsh in Gower also rose and slew about two hundred of their enemies. Other battles followed.

Henry had been long engaged in his contest with the English barons, but now he was alarmed at the state of things in Wales. The English from Pembroke and Rhos had invaded the part of Wales called Cemaes and carried off much booty and slew many men, including some chiefs. The Welsh of the district rose and pursued and defeated them. Llewelyn came from North Wales and joined the men of South Wales, and invaded the territory of Meredydd ab Rhys Gryg, Ystrad Tywy, to punish the prince for his supposed unfaithfulness to his country by now doing homage to the king of England. A battle was fought by the English and Meredydd on the one side and the Welsh of North and South Wales on the other side. The former were defeated, and fled to

Caermarthen after suffering much loss. In 1258 there were conflicts still in South Wales. There was a conference at Aberteivy, or Cardigan, between the leaders of the English party and the Welsh with the view of making peace; but the English, thinking they were the stronger, advanced on Cilgarran and suddenly attacked the Welsh; but though, through the suddenness of the attack, many of the Welsh fell, they rallied under the command of Davydd and entirely routed the English. In 1260 Llewelyn again marched into South Wales, occupied Builth, and the inhabitants submit ed to him. Then he advanced into Dyved and occupied the town of Tenby. Llewelyn carried all before him in South Wales, and the smaller princes swore fealty to him. These successes led King Henry to collect an army, which was to assemble at Shrewsbury against Llewelyn, which will come under notice further on in connection with the history of North Wales. In the year 1269 or 1270 the earl of Gloucester and Llewelyn were in disagreement. The earl's territory was in South Wales and adjoining the Welsh. The castle of Caerphilly belonged to him. This was burnt by Llewelyn. The king was informed, in reply to his remonstrance to Llewelyn that he had broken the peace, that he (Llewelyn) was willing to observe the peace unless provoked by the earl of Gloucester and others who had made preparations of war against him.

In the year 1276 or 1277 the English forces gained many victories in South Wales, having Caermarthen as the centre of their operations. The territory of Kidweli and Cardigan was subjugated, and the castles were destroyed in the district. The commander of the English forces was Paganus de Cadurcis, who ravaged the entire district of West Wales belonging to the Welsh.

Edward I. was now king of England, having succeeded his father, Henry III., who died in the year 1272, after a reign of fifty-six years and in the sixty-sixth year of his age. His reign was a disturbed one; conflicts with his barons continued during the greater portion—an inheritance from the reign of his predecessor, John. The power of the pope had been great during the reign of John, and was continued during Henry's time. The concurrence of the pope was then deemed necessary, and Henry had to swear fealty to him and renew the homage which John had rendered. When Henry died, Edward was away from England, having been engaged in an expedition in the Holy Land against the "infidels," or the Saracens. Although he was on his return journey when he heard of the death of his father, knowing that the country was then comparatively peaceful and that it was safe under the guardians of the realm, he remained in Italy and France more than a year before he appeared in England. He landed at Dover early in August, 1274, and was crowned at Westminster on the 19th of the same month.

During the reigns of John and Henry III., England was so much disturbed by the conflicts of the kings and the barons and the interference of the popes, that the Welsh princes and people were

able to gain some advantages, and they managed to maintain a certain measure of semi-independence. The accession of Edward I., however, was the beginning of a period during which they lost their independence, and the country was annexed to England. Edward was acquainted with the Welsh people before he became king, having commanded the English forces during his father's reign.

After the victories of the English in South Wales under Paganus, all the barons and princes of South Wales went and did homage to Edward. The king had given instructions to his commanders in Wales to receive into favour those Welsh chieftains who were willing to acknowledge his authority and become his vassals. In South Wales this policy prevailed, and Rhys ab Meredydd, the prince of South Wales, or lord of Dynevwr, gave the example to the minor lords and submitted to the king on the condition of holding his territory immediately from the king and free from subordination to any one else. As stated above, all the lords and chiefs followed the example and submitted to the king and gave up some strong fortresses to the king's forces. Edward had sent a body of troops into South Wales under Paganus, whilst he himself was at the head of an army operating against North Wales, which will be described in the next chapter.

The continuation of peace in Wales could not be depended upon. Disputes between the English and the Welsh arose, often from small causes. Differences of opinion as to the meaning of agreements or treaties were common. The fact is, the treaties were observed on both sides only as long as convenient. The treatment of the Welsh by Edward and his lords and commanders was very severe and unjust, and produced great discontent in North and South Wales. "The rigorous exactions of the English officers in Wales, partial and oppressive and repugnant to the manners of the people, heightened their sufferings to an insupportable degree." In the same period, 1280–1, there was much distress arising from bad seasons and disease and mortality among cattle and sheep. Under these circumstances the Welsh were excited and again revolted. Llewelyn and his brother Davydd were persuaded to be reconciled and to join in a desperate campaign against the English. These two princes were placed at the head of the movement. North Wales was the centre of the movement, and Llewelyn, its prince, was the leader. The conquest of the country by Edward will be described in the next chapter. The spirit of opposition to the English spread like wildfire through Wales. The princes and people of South Wales joined the movement and followed the leadership of Llewelyn. Gruffydd ab Meredydd and Rhys ab Maelgwn headed a campaign in Cardigan and Caermarthen. The castle of Aberystwith was taken by surprise; other fortresses in South Wales were captured by the minor chiefs who had joined the movement. Cardiganshire, or Caredigion, as then named, and Caervyrddin were ravaged, or the portions in the occupation of the English. The Welsh at first

carried all before them, and threw themselves with impetuosity on castles and districts occupied by the English.

This national movement in South and North Wales surprised the English monarch and his warriors, and Edward determined to prepare such an army as would entirely conquer the whole of Wales and annex it to England. The earl of Gloucester and Sir Edmund Mortimer were ordered to proceed with an army into South Wales to check the Welsh princes and to subdue the country. A great battle was fought near to Llandeilo Vawr. The earl of Gloucester suffered much loss, including five knights, but the Welsh were nearly cut to pieces. The English forces advanced over the country and gained victories everywhere. Llewelyn himself left North Wales and went to the assistance of his confederates in South Wales. He succeeded in his campaign in Caredigion and Strath-Towi. Then he proceeded to the district of Builth to secure the chief pass in that region. The result of the fighting in this district was the defeat of the Welsh and the death of Llewelyn ab Gruffydd after a reign of thirty-six years. His history will be narrated in the next chapter. The conquest of South Wales will be included in the conquest of North Wales by Edward I.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE ANCIENT BRITONS IN THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES—*continued*

THE previous chapter was mainly devoted to the history of South Wales—the conflicts between the Normans and the Britons and among the Britons themselves. The barons were more successful in South Wales than in the north. In the earliest part of the Norman period they established their power in South Wales by the construction of castles on the borders and on the coasts, and from these as strong centres of operations they carried on a continual warfare which ended in the final conquest of the country. North Wales was more compact and united, and maintained independence for a longer period. The kingdom of Gwynedd remained stronger, and became the centre of operations for North Wales and for Powys, and to some extent for South Wales, and was the last to give way to the increasing power of England.

Our previous account of North Wales ended with the death of the distinguished monarch of Gwynedd, Gruffydd ab Cynan, whose career came to end in the year 1137.

The kingdom of Gwynedd in ancient times was much larger than it was during even the prosperous reign of Gruffydd ab Cynan. It included a portion of Cheshire. Up to the time of Egbert—the ninth century—Chester was its capital. About the year 870 Roderic the Great made Aberffraw, in Anglesey, the capital and one of the three royal residences, changing from Caer Segont, near Caernarvon. The reason of the change was not very apparent, as Caer Segont was amidst the mountainous region of Snowdon, so often the place of defence to which the Welsh retired. The Normans very soon captured and fortified the city of Chester, and Hugh Lupus became its earl. Under this earl the Norman territory in Wales was extended, and Flintshire became part of the English dominion.

Gruffydd ab Cynan, who died at the age of eighty-two after a reign of over fifty years, was the last who bore the title of king of Gwynedd. His successors were designated princes. He had three sons and five daughters by his wife Angharad, and, according to the Welsh Chronicle, he had other children, five in number, not by his wife. The social morality in those ancient times among the princes of all countries was very lax. This is very obvious to the reader of history—of the Saxons and the Normans especially.

Illegitimate children were often recognised and placed in high positions in the state. The three legitimate sons of Gruffydd ab Cynan were Owain, Cadwaladr, and Cadwallon. The last died before his father.

The eldest son, Owain, succeeded his father as the sovereign of Gwynedd, and was designated Owain Gwynedd, under which designation he is known in history. He and his brother Cadwaladr were warriors during their father's lifetime, and headed successful expeditions. In the first year of his reign Owain and his brother Cadwaladr led an expedition—the third of the kind—into South Wales. They were joined by the three sons of the prince of South Wales. The progress of Owain was triumphant through South Wales. The castles of Ystrad-Meiric, Stephan, and Humphrey were burnt, and also the town of Caermarthen. He succeeded in compelling the inhabitants of Pembroke to pay him tribute and to recognise his supremacy. The invasions of South Wales by the princes of North Wales and their victories have been described in the preceding chapter.

Owain Gwynedd was undoubtedly a great prince and a warrior, and during his reign of thirty-two years gained many victories and suffered some reverses. In accordance with the character of the times, his morality was not of a high order. He was married twice—first to Gwladys, daughter of Llywarch, lord of Pembroke, by whom he had only one child, Iorwerth Drowyndwn, or the "crooked nose." His second wife was Christian, the daughter of Gronw, son of Owain ab Edwyn, Lord of Englefield, a district which extended from Chester to the Clwyd. By her he had four children—Davydd, Roderic, Cadwallon, and Angharad. According to the Welsh Chronicles he had four children by his first wife. In addition he had twelve other children by different women. These illegitimate children included the warriors Howel and Cynan. The princes and peoples of those times in Wales, England, and Europe generally, were given to lax practices in social life. The affection of Owain Gwynedd was as great for his illegitimate children as for the others. An illustration may be given here: The natural son of Owain, whose name was Rhun, was a favourite of the prince, and his death in or about the year 1143 gave him such sorrow that he retired for a time to weep in solitude. In the year 1144 the troops of North Wales laid siege to the castle of Mold in Flintshire. It was a strong place, and long held out. Owain was induced to leave his solitude and take a part in the military operations, and success soon followed. The Welsh stormed and captured the place, and and it was destroyed. The garrison that survived were made prisoners.

A quarrel occurred in the year 1146 between the sons of Owain Gwynedd—Howel and Cynan—and their uncle Cadwaladr—another illustration of the divided character of the Welsh princes, the source of much misery and weakness. The usual consequence followed—a war. Cadwaladr was in possession of Meirionydd and some places in South Wales, including Cynvael, then kept for him

by the abbot of Ty Gwyn whose name was Mervyn. The sons of Owain raised an army and invaded Meirionydd. The terror of the inhabitants was allayed by the announcement that they would suffer no harm if they would submit to the new authority. The territory was soon occupied and subdued, and soon afterwards the castle of Cynvael. Thus the territories and castles of Cadwaladr were seized by his nephews, the illegitimate sons of Owain. In two or three years afterwards another of the castles and the remainder of the territory were seized, and Cadwaladr himself was made prisoner by Howel. Family disaffection under the influence of ambition is always apt to spread. In this case Howel had not long been in the occupation of Caredigion when the sons of Gruffydd ab Rhys, of South Wales, invaded and subdued it, except one castle, and acted very cruelly to the garrisons that ultimately surrendered. This was in the year 1150, or possibly a little later. Howel was probably prevented from marching to the defence of his territory by a war which broke out between Gwynedd and the English.

The earl of Chester at this time—1150 or 1152—was Ranulph. To restore his military credit tarnished by previous defeats in Wales, it is said that he prepared a powerful expedition against North Wales. He collected troops from England and from his own vassals. He also entered into an agreement with the prince of Powys, Madoc ab Meredydd. This Welsh principality, as previously described, was nominally subject to the prince of Gwynedd. Madoc, however, desired to be emancipated from this subjection, and for this purpose joined the earl of Chester in his attack on North Wales—another illustration of the want of unity among Welshmen which led to weakness and final conquest by the English. The combined forces advanced against Gwynedd. Owain, the prince of North Wales, prepared to meet his foes, and even anticipated them by marching into Flintshire, which belonged to the earl of Chester. The antagonists met at a place called Consyllt, in Flintshire. The English army was the more numerous, but the men of Gwynedd, under the command of their prince, Owain, exhibited the greatest enthusiasm. They began the battle and gained the victory even in the open field. The English were entirely beaten: many of them were slain, others were taken prisoners, and the English leaders escaped only by the swiftness of their horses.

Soon after the events narrated, Cadwaladr, the brother of Owain, who had been imprisoned by his nephew Howel and robbed of his possessions, made his escape to Anglesey. There he raised troops and gained over and occupied part of the island, which belonged to the dominion of his brother Owain. His success was only temporary, for Owain marched against him and defeated his forces, which were probably only few, and he himself escaped to England and sought the protection and assistance of his wife's relations, who was the daughter of Gilbert, the earl of Clare.

In the year 1154 Stephen, the king of England, died, after a reign of twenty years—a reign of "misrule and disorder unknown in our history," as described by Green. He was succeeded by Henry II., and his reign formed a new era in the history of Wales. This monarch was sagacious, brave, and energetic, and was a formidable enemy to Wales. His relation to South Wales has been described, and now we must narrate the events of his history in relation to North Wales. As usual, internal discord and quarrels among the Welsh princes were one of the sources of weakness, and one of the inducements of the English to attempt again the conquest of Wales. Owain marched an army into South Wales against the Lord Rhys and to avenge the attacks made upon his possessions in Caredigion. He advanced to the town of Cardigan, built the castle, strengthened the town, and then returned without any war.

The prince of Powys, Madoc ab Meredydd, had previously joined the English under the earl of Chester, and was apprehensive of the anger and vengeance of the king of Gwynedd. He constructed a castle at Careinion, known even now by the name of Castle Careinion, in Montgomeryshire. He also continued his alliance with the English, and tried to induce the king of England to invade North Wales. Cadwaladr also was now residing in England and used his influence in the same direction. Under these influences Henry II. resolved to attempt the conquest of Wales.

In the year 1157 Henry collected an army, estimated to number 30,000 men, and marched into North Wales. He advanced to Chester and thence into Flintshire, and pitched his camp at Saltney. Owain Gwynedd advanced to meet the king, and encamped near Holywell at a place called Basingwerk. In this position he waited the attack of the English army, resolved to pursue the general plan of the Welsh to avoid a general engagement in the open country. The Welsh did not yield to the temptation to leave the camp and engage in a general battle. Henry sent forward a select body of men under the command of distinguished leaders who were barons, with the alleged object of inducing the Welsh to leave their defensive position and enter upon a contest in the open field. In this the English king was disappointed. The detachment, in advancing, passed through a woody and rough district, and there the Welsh troops under the command of the sons of Owain Gwynedd—Davydd and Cynan—were lying in ambush, and at a certain time rushed suddenly and with great impetuosity upon the English troops and nearly cut them to pieces. Many were slain, and the remainder fled in disorder to the main body of their army. The place where this took place is called in Welsh authorities Coed Eulo, situated near Hawarden, but described by English writers as marshy and full of thickets, and forming the difficult pass of Coleshill. This attack produced terror and even consternation among the English, and the rumour was spread that even the king, Henry, was among the

slain. This rumour was, of course, false, but the great barons Eustace Fitz-John and Robert de Courcy were slain. The king, however, showed himself among his troops and rallied them again, and stopped the pursuit of the Welsh, and drove them back to their defensive position among the woods.

The king, having allayed the panic, gathered his army together and marched in the direction of Rhuddlan. The check which was given to the Welsh enabled the king to advance, and then the Welsh retired to a place called Cil Owain, or the Retreat of Owain, near St. Asaph. The troops of Owain continued to retreat before the entire army of the English king, but engaged in constant skirmishing and avoiding a general battle. Owain Gwynedd again retired to a stronger position, Bryn-y-Pin, within five miles of St. Asaph on the west. The king, however, advanced without opposition to Rhuddlan, which he strengthened and made the base of operations. He cleared the neighbourhood of woods and constructed new roads for the passage of his army. The prince of Gwynedd, unable to engage in open war the formidable army of Henry, indulged in skirmishing and in incessant small attacks from his strong position on the hills.

Another instrument of war was now introduced—the navy. Henry had gathered a number of war ships at or near Chester for the purpose of landing his troops on the coast of North Wales. We must not imagine these ships to be like our modern men-of-war, our ironclads, and cruisers—which, of course, could not approach Chester. They were, however, ships of power and of service. Henry ordered the fleet to proceed and make a descent on the island of Anglesey. The old spirit of Welsh dissension among the princes was shown in this naval expedition. The conductor or the guide of the fleet was Madoc ab Meredydd, the reigning prince of the Welsh principality of Powys, who had previously formed an alliance with the English as shown on a preceding page. He was probably employed because he was acquainted with the coasts. The expedition was, however, a failure. The troops on board were landed on the island, and proceeded to plunder and destroy even churches; but the men of Anglesey were then a brave and warlike people, and they soon gathered their forces and made a successful attack on the invaders on their way back to their ships, and cut many of them to pieces. The remainder, having gained their ships, were terrified, and quickly sailed back to Chester after losing some horses and ships. The poet, Gwalchmai ab Meilyr, designated this successful Welsh attack, the victory of Tal-y-Maelevre, in his ode to Owain Gwynedd, concluding one of his verses thus rendered—

> "Shrieks answering, and slaughter raving,
> And high o'er Maelevre's front a thousand banners waving."

The military operations on land were not much affected by the failure of the naval expedition. The army of Henry in the occu-

pation of Rhuddlan Castle was too strong for Owain to assail with any prospect of success, and the navy he feared would prevent the importation of the food which was necessary for the sustentation of his army in the mountainous regions. In these circumstances Owain opened up communications with Henry, and agreed to submit and to do homage to the king, the agreement to include the chiefs under Owain's supremacy. This occurred in the year 1157—the third of Henry's reign. In the following year, 1158, the peace was completed, and all the princes of Wales except Rhys ab Gruffydd, the lord of South Wales, were included. These princes repaired to the court of Henry and did homage to him. The conditions of the peace were hard. The princes were to do homage to Henry for their territories, to yield up the castles and lands taken from the English in the reign of Stephen ; Owain was to restore to favour his brother Cadwaladr and the territories taken from him, and to hand over two of his sons as hostages to the king. The negotiations of Henry with the lord of South Wales, which led to his submission, has been described in the preceding chapter, and also the events which resulted from Rhys's violation of his agreement.

The prince of Powys, who had joined the English in the war of Henry against North Wales, retired to England and died at Winchester in the year 1160. His name was Madoc ab Meredydd. His body was brought from England and interred at Mathraval, near Meifod, in the county of Montgomery, which had been the capital of Powys since the time that King Offa of Mercia had taken Pengwern, or Shrewsbury, the ancient capital of this principality. Notwithstanding his disloyalty to his country by uniting with King Henry against North Wales, the poet Gwalchmai, who had composed an ode in praise of Owain Gwynedd, now praised Madoc in an ode which glorified him as one who "feared God and gave to the poor." Thus he sang—

"Yes, Britain owns thy sway,
Friend of the bardic lay,
And blended o'er be they,
Thy country and thy fame !

To farthest climes are known
Thy worth, thy high renown ;
Thy might, as Arthur's grown,
With Medrawd's skill arrayed."

This is an illustration of how little reliance can be placed on the historical accuracy of the bardic performances. The principality of Powys was divided into two parts by Rhodric, namely, Powys Vadoc and Powys Gwenwynwyn.

Madoc ab Meredydd left three sons—named Gruffydd Maelor, Owain, and Ellis—and one daughter by his wife Susannah, who was the daughter of the great prince of Gwynedd, Gruffydd ab Cynan. Like other princes of the times, Welsh and English, he had illegitimate children. Three such sons were recognised—Owain

Brogyntyn and two others. The principality of Powys was divided into several parts, presided over by different princes. The Welsh custom or law of *gavel-kind* provided for a division of the inheritance of a father among his children or heirs. This custom expressed a righteous principle when applied to private property, real or personal, but was found inconvenient and injurious when applied to the government of a state. To divide a principality or a province among the children of a deceased prince led to confusion, weakness, and ultimate ruin. In those ancient times the distinction between private and state property, so clearly recognised in modern times, was very indistinctly apprehended. The government of a state was regarded as the peculiar property of the reigning prince, which should be divided among his children. Thus Powys was divided among the children of Madoc—Gruffydd Maelor, Owain, and others. Also another Owain, the nephew of Madoc, had a district assigned to him called Cyveiliog, east of Machynlleth, which constituted a large portion of the Powys Madoc, which was one-half of the ancient principality of Powys. This prince was designated Owain Cyveiliog. By this subdivision Powys was broken up into small lordships, and never again existed as a powerful Welsh state. The natural result of this subdivision was the creation of small rulers within narrow domains, easily led to conflict with their neighbours. Hence, we find that soon after the settlement of the princes in their small districts, Owain Cyveiliog and his cousin Owain ab Madoc and others, entered and attacked the province of Gruffydd Maelor ab Madoc, and captured his castle of Carreghova.

The revolt in Wales and the confederation of the Welsh princes against the English have been described, so far as South Wales was concerned, in the preceding chapter. We now come to describe the movement in North Wales. The princes of North Wales, including those of Powys, united in the general movement of Wales against the king of England. Henry was in Normandy when the movement of the Welsh princes took place. In returning to England, he brought over with him many troops from Normandy, Anjou, Gascony, Flanders, and even Brittany, and employed them in the conquest of the Welsh. The Welsh princes of Gwynedd—Owain and Cadwaladr—and those of Powys—the sons of the late Madoc ab Meredydd and Owain Cyveiliog, their leader—were now united in the attempt to deliver their country from foreign domination. The English army under Henry advanced, in the year 1165, towards North Wales, and assembled near the town of Oswestry in Shropshire, on the confines of Wales, where they encamped for some time. Henry expected that the presence of his formidable army would induce some of the confederated princes to forsake the confederacy, especially those of Powys, who on previous occasions had sided with the English against their countrymen of Gwynedd. In this expectation the king was disappointed, and the Welsh princes were for once united. The combined forces of Wales, South and North, and Powys—were assembled under their princes

—the lord Rhys of South Wales, Owain Gwynedd of North Wales, and his brother Cadwaladr, and the sons of Madoc and Owain Cyveiliog for Powys. These Welsh forces were assembled at Corwen, in the district called Edeyrnion, a strong place for purposes of defence. Here they waited for the approach of Henry and his army. Henry advanced to the river Ceiriog, in Denbighshire, clearing the country of woods in his march, to prevent any ambuscades as in the previous war in Flintshire. In attempting to force the bridge over the river, a skirmish occurred, in which the king nearly lost his life by an arrow thrown by a Welsh soldier, which was intercepted by Hubert de St. Clare, who fell dead at the king's feet pierced by the missile in his bosom. The opposition of the Welsh was overcome, and the passage was forced by the numbers of the English. The English army, not without considerable losses, advanced and encamped for some days on the Berwyn mountains, where the two armies confronted each other. In this wild situation the English army were cut off from supplies, and their convoys and foraging parties were often captured by the light-armed Welsh soldiers who swarmed in the surrounding country. Heavy rains also came on. In this condition the king was unable to advance, and ordered his army to retreat, which they did with great loss of men and material. They retired on Chester, where were gathered ships of war, with which Henry intended to aid in the invasion of North Wales. After remaining at Chester for some time, completing his preparations for the invasion by sea and land, the king changed his mind suddenly, abandoned his scheme of invasion and dismissed his ships, and returned to England. This second failure excited in Henry much anger, and he gave vent to his feelings in a most cruel and barbarous manner. The princes of Wales had previously given hostages for their good behaviour and loyalty to the English king. The king now ordered twenty-two of them to be mutilated and to have their eyes drawn out. Among those thus treated were two sons of the prince of Gwynedd and two of the prince of South Wales, Rhys ab Gruffydd. Th · excuse for such a barbarous act was, of course, the violation of the agreement made by the princes with him, but he did not consider that he himself had disregarded the conditions of the agreement. Such was war in those olden times, and such was the barbarous and cruel spirit manifested by kings and the powerful.

The departure of Henry II. from Wales did not put an end to war. In the year 1166 Owain Gwynedd, the prince of North Wales, captured the castle of Basingwerk, in Flintshire, and destroyed it. This castle had only recently been strongly fortified by King Henry. About the same time another instance of internal discord occurred. The two princes of Powys—Owain Cyveiliog and Owain Vychan—made an attack upon another prince of the same principality of Powys, Iorwerth Goch, and seized his lands and divided them amongst themselves. His territory consisted of Rhaedr Mochnant. In the following year, 1167, Owain Gwynedd

and his brother Cadwaladr, joined by Rhys of South Wales, invaded Powys and took possession of the territory of Owain Cyveiliog, and drove him away into England. The prince retained a portion of the territory for himself, and gave another portion—Caer Einion—to Owain Vychan. It is narrated that Owain Cyveiliog soon returned with the aid of some English troops and captured Caer Einion.

The above was only an incident in the complicated affairs of Wales. About the same time, 1167, Owain Gwynedd, Cadwaladr, and Rhys advanced against the castles in North Wales in the possession of the English. The castle of Rhuddlan was, next to Chester, the strongest position held by the English in North Wales. This, besieged and, after two months gallantly defended, was captured by the Welsh and entirely destroyed. They then proceeded to the less important castle of Prestatyn, which was more easily taken and destroyed. By these conquests the entire coast of North Wales came under the power of the Welsh. The important district named Tegingle, or Tegangle, called also Englefield, was occupied by them. This fertile district comprehended the then hundreds of Coleshill, Prestatyn, and Rhuddlan, from Chester to the Clwyd. Henry the Second was too much engaged at this time in his contest with the bishop, Becket, and with a war in Normandy against the king of France, to be able to give his serious attention to the affairs of Wales.

In the year 1169 Wales suffered a great loss by the sudden death of Owain Gwynedd, the prince of North Wales ; though according to the "Annales Cambriæ" the event occurred two years later. The former is probably the correct date. He reigned over Gwynedd for thirty-two years—from 1137 to 1169. He was a great and powerful prince, and the son of a great prince, Gruffydd ab Cynan. Like his father, he was interred in the Bangor cathedral church. He has been described as fortunate and victorious in all his affairs. His two wives and his numerous children have been already described. His career was varied : at one time submitting to the supreme authority of the English king and afterwards resisting that authority, and dying during a period of national triumph.

The succession to the crown of Gwynedd was contested by the many children of Owain. The eldest son—the child of his first wife, Gwladys, whose name was Iorwerth, and whose popular surname was Drowyndwn, or the Crooked Nose—was placed aside on the ground of his deformity of nose, receiving, however, as his portion the lordship of two cantrevs, Nauconwy and Ardudwy. The illegitimate son of Owain, Howel, whose mother was an Irish lady, asserted his right to the throne, and by force gained possession for a time. Davydd, the eldest son by the second wife, Christian, raised an army and opposed and overthrew Howel, and according to some accounts, slew him in battle and then ascended the throne of Gwynedd in the year 1171. The position of Davydd was not considered by himself secure amidst the disputes and contentions of so many brothers and relations. One of his brothers,

named Maelgwn, was the lord of Anglesey. According to another account the lord of Anglesey was his brother Rhodri, whom he deposed. He also took the lands of the other brothers and reigned supreme over the whole of Gwynedd, or North Wales. These family contests arose mainly from the Welsh custom of gavel-kind, which required the division of the father's inheritance among the children, including the governmental territories. These events occurred about the year 1175.

Henry II. had not overlooked Wales amidst his other occupations. He tried the policy of conciliation, and gave to Davydd in marriage his sister, who was illegitimate. This shows that in those days illegitimacy was very common in the royal families of England and Wales, and that it was recognised, and the children were treated as royal persons of distinction. The brother of Owain Gwynedd, Cadwaladr, who was lord of Caredigion, was driven from Wales into England by Owain, and sought the protection and assistance of Henry. On his way from England to Wales he was murdered by some Englishmen. Henry, however, had all the persons concerned in the deed executed. This was in the year 1179. The discord among the Welsh princes was again shown by the contest between the two brothers, Rhodri and Davydd. The former had escaped from prison and fled to Anglesey, and was welcomed by the people, who had grown tired of Davydd's tyranny. He soon gained the whole of Anglesey, and even that portion of Gwynedd which was within the river Conway. Davydd withdrew to the English side of the Conway, and held the castle of Rhuddlan and the adjacent country.

Henry II. died in the year 1189 after a reign of thirty-four years. This monarch began his reign with the determination of wholly conquering and subduing Wales, North and South; but he did not accomplish his purpose. The internal discord in his own royal family and among his own people, and the contest with Thomas à Becket, occupied so much of his attention and energies that he left the task unfinished. He did, however, succeed in making the Welsh princes nominally his vassals, who obeyed his summons to attend the parliament at Oxford in the year 1176, where they recognised the king as supreme and received from him certain privileges, including lands in Ellesmere to Davydd. He was succeeded on the throne by his eldest son Richard. The only son who paid attention to him in his final hours was Geoffrey, his illegitimate son, whose mother was the fair Rosamond.

It will be remembered that the eldest son of Owain Gwynedd was set aside from the throne because of his broken or crooked nose, on which account he was surnamed Drowyndwn. He is known in history as Iorwerth Drowyndwn. This act, though generally agreed to, was not legal or just. The son of Iorwerth did not forget the indignity to his father because of a bodily deformity, and when he became a matured man he laid claim to the throne of Gwynedd. He was popular and of great ability.

His name was Llewelyn ab Iorwerth. He appealed for popular support and he gained it. He obtained the assistance of the men of Powys on the ground that his mother was of that state, being the daughter of Madoc, prince of that state. Young Llewelyn became the reigning prince, and Davydd was deposed. This was in the year 1194. Davydd, however, by the assistance of the English garrisons, still held some fortress in North Wales. Some three years afterwards Davydd, aided by some troops of English and Welsh who had adhered to his cause, endeavoured to recover his lost dominions; but he failed. Llewelyn went to meet his uncle and defeated him and took him a prisoner and kept him in confinement.

The principality of Powys was divided into two parts, as previously described, and designated Powys Vadoc and Powys Gwenwynwyn. At the close of the year 1197 Owain Cyveiliog died and left the higher Powys to his son Gwenwynwyn, and henceforth called after his name. The late prince of Gwynedd, Davydd, was released from prison by Llewelyn his nephew. He used his liberty by raising an army in England to attempt again to recover his lost dominions. He was, however, defeated again, and soon after, in the year 1203, he died.

In the year 1199 King Richard died from a wound inflicted by an arrow in battle in France in the tenth year of his reign. Leaving no issue, he was succeeded by his youngest brother John, the fifth son of Henry II. His reign of seventeen years was important in the constitutional history of England and in the affairs of Wales.

It is impossible to notice the deaths of the numerous princes and lords of the different parts of Wales. In the beginning of Richard's reign, about 1190, Gruffydd Maelor, lord of the two Bromfields, died, and was interred at the capital of Powys near Meifod, leaving one son, Madoc, to succeed him as prince of Powys Madoc. Also in the year 1195 Rhodri ab Owain died.

Whilst John was engaged in foreign wars, Wales was not overlooked. In the year 1202 the Welsh princes and lords were summoned to the assembly which met at Hereford. The king was represented by his justiciary. Llewelyn, the prince of North Wales, and many other princes and lords attended, and a treaty was then agreed to and signed. Llewelyn and the other princes swore fealty to King John and agreed to hold their territories under him as the liege lord and to do homage to him for their lands, that when the king himself returned to England they should, when summoned, appear before him and pay homage to him. They agreed to certain arrangements for the settlement of any disputes that may arise in the future which should be tried and determined according to English or Welsh laws, as may be arranged, according to circumstances. This treaty was considered humiliating to the prince of North Wales and his subordinate lords, and showed very clearly how the power of the English king was gaining over the Welsh princes.

Llewelyn, soon after the agreement made at Hereford, directed his attention to the internal condition of Wales. For many centuries the prince of North Wales had been recognised as supreme in North Wales and Powys, and indeed throughout Wales, North and South, and the other princes commonly paid him a measure of fealty. It is stated that in the year 1203, feeling the importance of unity, Llewelyn summoned a meeting, sometimes called a parliament, of the princes and lords of Wales for the purpose of binding them into a more compact federation. The princes, conscious of the value of such union under one head, obeyed the summons and took the oath of fealty to Llewelyn. There was one exception to the unanimity. Gwenwynwyn, the prince of one portion of the divided state of Powys, refused to attend the meeting and join in the oath of allegiance. The assembly agreed that he should be compelled to do his duty or quit his territory. To this decision there was one exception, namely, Elis ab Madoc, who was a dependent chief of Gwenwynwyn. He refused to agree with the other chiefs and suddenly left the assembly. Llewelyn was not to be trifled with. He had recently, on the suspicion of treason, banished his cousin Meredydd from his territory and confiscated his lands. And now he led an army into Powys, but before any military action took place Gwenwynwyn was induced by friends to submit and take the oath of fealty. Llewelyn then proceeded against Elis, drove him from the country, and took his estates. He also was soon induced to submit and was restored to some portion of his estate—the castle Crogen and seven townships. This story is regarded by some writers as doubtful or much exaggerated.

The marriage relations of princes in olden times in Wales and England and other countries were not usually according to the standard of morality. Llewelyn married during his father's lifetime Sina, the daughter of Caradoc ab Thomas. Then it is narrated that he married, when young, Tangwstle, the daughter of Llywarch Goch, the lord of Rhos, and there was by her one son, Gruffydd ab Llewelyn, the heir to the possession of Englefield and other districts. Finally, when John returned from France after a disastrous war, he gave to Llewelyn as a reward for his fidelity his illegitimate daughter Joan, whose mother was Agatha, daughter of Robert Ferrers, the earl of Derby, in marriage and with her the lordship of Ellesmere as a dowry. The date was probably the year 1205. It does not appear what had become of the other wives.

Llewelyn, as previously stated, invaded South Wales and succeeded in gaining many victories and subduing the country. About the same time, 1208, Llewelyn invaded the portion of Powys over which Gwenwynwyn ruled and captured its castles and territory. At this time the prince of Powys was a prisoner by the authority of King John. He had gone to Shrewsbury to have some communication with the king's council and for some reason was detained a prisoner. He was afterwards liberated, swore fealty to John, and the king bound himself to protect the prince and his territory. Llewelyn, under the order of John, made some satisfac-

tion for the injuries he had inflicted on the prince of Powys, and was thereby reconciled to John, who professed to pardon him and spoke of him as his son.

In the year 1210 the earl of Chester invaded North Wales and rebuilt the castle of Diganwy on the Conway, which Llewelyn had previously destroyed. The castle of Trefynnon, or Holywell, he also strengthened and fortified. The earl of Chester at that time was Ranulph. In retaliation for this aggression Llewelyn invaded the territory belonging to the earl of Chester, and in the usual manner devastated the land and carried off much booty. At this time Ranulph, the earl of Chester, was shut up in Rhuddlan Castle, and to relieve him Roger de Lacy, the earl's constable and lord of Halton, marched at the head of troops collected at Chester during the midsummer fair, and said to consist of a mere rabble of scamps. The object was, however, attained. In the following year, 1211, Llewelyn renewed his attacks on the territory of the earl. John was so angry with the prince of North Wales that he determined to march a powerful army into Wales for the purpose of putting an end to Welsh incursions and of reducing the country entirely to his government. This army was assembled at Oswestry in Shropshire. It consisted of the English and many Welsh troops belonging to Powys and South Wales. The troops had advanced to Oswestry from South Wales. From Oswestry the army advanced to Chester. From this city they proceeded along the coast to Rhuddlan Castle and Diganwy. From these strongholds the royal army purposed to operate as from safe centres. Llewelyn, unable to meet such an army in the open field, resolved to adopt the usual Welsh plan of operations, retiring into the mountainous region of Snowdon, and by cutting off the sources of supply and issuing forth from their safe recesses and attacking separate detachments and destroying them, they hoped to defeat the invading army. Llewelyn ordered the inhabitants of the plains of our Flintshire and Denbighshire to remove into the mountains and to carry with them all their movable property—cattle and sheep—and to turn the country into a desert where the enemy could procure no food. This policy or plan of campaign was successful. The English army was reduced to difficulties. The supplies sent from England were captured and the foraging parties were cut off. The army had to kill their horses to supply the men with food, and the soldiers, whenever they stirred from the camp, were pounced upon by the Welsh, who were on the watch for them. Under these circumstances King John ordered his army to retreat after having suffered great loss.

John was, however, not disposed to abandon the enterprise, and in a few months he returned with augmented numbers and was again joined by many Welsh chiefs from Powys and South Wales as his vassals. The place of assembly was the same, Oswestry, thence the king directed his troops into North Wales, strengthening many castles and destroying many places. The army arrived on the Conway, where they encamped. The Welsh troops were

gathered in the same region of Snowdon. John sent a strong detachment, guided by men who knew the country, to attack and destroy the important town of Bangor. This object was accomplished and the bishop was taken prisoner, captured at the altar, and subjected to some indignities. He was afterwards ransomed by money, or, as told by another authority, by two hundred hawks. The English army had penetrated into the country and seemed to be gaining head. Llewelyn, who stood alone even among the Welsh princes, resolved to negotiate for peace with King John, who was his father-in-law. He employed his wife Joan to negotiate with her father, and she was aided by the Welsh nobles. Peace was made, Llewelyn again did homage to John for his lands, gave hostages to the number of twenty-eight or thirty as security for the due observance of his oath. He had also to pay 20,000 head of cattle and forty horses as payment for the expenses of the war, and granted to the king for ever the inland territory east of the Conway. The amount of compensation is differently described by various authorities. The condition of Wales was thus placed by Llewelyn himself in subjection to England, but still in the position of internal independence or semi-independence.

The arrangement made by Llewelyn with King John in the year 1211 did not last long. The position of affairs in England was anything but pleasant for the king. The pope had placed him and his kingdom under an interdict, which in an age of superstition and priestly power was a serious matter. He had also in opposition to John absolved Llewelyn from his oath of allegiance and had removed the interdict from Wales. In these circumstances, in the year 1212 or 1213, Llewelyn summoned a meeting of the Welsh princes from South Wales and from Powys, and presenting to them the miserable and degraded condition of their country as dependent on England, the result mainly of their own divisions, he showed them that even now, by union and a patriotic spirit, they might emancipate themselves from foreign bondage and vassalage. He seemed to succeed in persuading the assembled princes, and they took the oath of allegiance to Llewelyn, the prince of North Wales, according to ancient custom.

Under the inspiration of this new confederacy, Llewelyn collected a combined army and commenced military operations. In a short time most of the castles which had recently been built or fortified in Powys and Gwynedd by the English were captured. The garrisons were partly slain, some were set free, and others made prisoners. Of course, there was much plunder and many villages were burnt. In the course of this campaign Llewelyn fell upon the castle of Mathraval, the capital of Powys, in Montgomeryshire, which had been lately built by Robert de Vipont in the interest of the king. The siege, however, was protracted so long that John was able to go to its relief. The confederates retired on John's approach. The presence of the king was much needed in England, and having destroyed this castle he retired from Wales. The war continued and much loss was inflicted on the English troops.

The stong castles of Rhuddlan and Diganwy were not captured in the recent early campaign when so many other less important castles fell. A short time afterwards the Welsh forces under Llewelyn were able to capture these strong castles. Thus Wales was freed from the domination of the English king, and Llewelyn was everywhere triumphant. During this period of conflict the scene of operations, including the border-lands or the Marches, was one of devastation and slaughter. John was so angry when he heard of the injuries inflicted on his subjects on the Marches and in Wales itself, that he assembled an army at Nottingham, intending to march into Wales and chastise the rebellious princes. He had in his possession hostages of noble Welsh families to the number of twenty-eight or thirty, mostly young men, and John, when at Nottingham, de'ermined to hang them. The resolution indicated the cruel nature of the king and the savage character of the times. Accordiug to some authorities the resolution was carried out, but according to others it was prevented by the same cause as led the king to abandon his intention to invade Wales for the present, and he returned to London. The story goes that John received at the same time, when at Nottingham, a letter from the king of Scotland and another from his daughter Joan, wife of Llewelyn, to announce that a conspiracy had been formed to slay him if he persisted in the war. This intelligence acting on such a mind as John's—superstitious and guilty of many crimes—made him melancholy for a time, and induced him to return to London and to suspend operations. The threat of John to execute the hostages was in accordance with the spirit of the age, for we find that about the same time Rhys, the son of Maelgwn, a mere child of seven years, was hanged by Robert de Vipont at Shrewsbury.

The milita·y operations of John were much impeded by his quarrel with the English barons and with the pope. His conflict with the pope was, however, ended by his submission. The pope then took sides with John and actually ex-communicated Llewelyn and his confederates because they were making war against the king of England. Such was the inconsistent conduct of the head of the church, who aimed at the supreme power of the church over kings and natio·s and not at the welfare of princes or peoples. The barons on the other hand entered into an alliance with Llewelyn, and thus excited alarm in the mind of John and led him to send commissioners to Llewelyn to make some pacific arrangements.

In the year 1215, Llewelyn is reported as making an incursion into Powys, and easily gaining possession of the town and castle of Shrewsbury. This town did not belong to the principality of Powys, but the earl of Shrewsbury as representing the English king had acquired part of Powys, including Montgomery town and castle, and that portion was under the Shrewsbury earldom. Llewelyn was now the supreme prince of Wales, North and South, and had carried everything before him. In his capacity of lord paramount he went into South Wales in the year 1216 to arbitrate

in the family disputes of the late Rhys ab Gruffydd ; and on his return he learnt that Gwenwynwyn, the lord of higher Powys, had again become a vassal of the English king and had renounced his allegiance to Llewelyn. After the failure of remonstrance and persuasive means, Llewelyn invaded the country, laid it waste, and compelled the lord to flee to the territory of the earl of Chester. About this time, or rather in the year 1215, Llewelyn gave his daughter in marriage to Reginald de Bruce, one of the English lords in South Wales. The object of the marriage was political. In those times, as in modern days, marriages among the great were generally arranged, not for the domestic happiness of the person married, but for State conveniences.

King John was much harassed by his barons and other opponents, and he retired to Hereford, where Reginald de Bruce was the earl. From here he sent to the earl and to Llewelyn to solicit aid ; but Llewelyn refused all assistance. The king, after appealing to the Welsh chiefs of South Wales in vain, destroyed the castles of Hay, Radnor, and Clun, and departed to Oswestry, and finding no response from his son-in-law, Llewelyn, he burnt the town and retired to England. After some efforts in the north of England, John arrived at Newark suffering from a fever, where he died on the 17th of October, 1216, in the eighteenth year of his reign and the forty-ninth of his age. He was succeeded by his son, Henry III.

The reign of Henry III. was the beginning of a more energetic policy for the final conquest of Wales. Henry, as shown in the last chapter, was only a boy of nine or ten when he succeeded to the throne, and the earl of Pembroke became the actual ruler. Under his wise and powerful government peace was made between the barons and the throne, and the charter was duly confirmed. Then attention was paid to the affairs of Wales. Llewelyn received a summons to attend at Hereford and to proceed from there to Northampton to do homage to Henry III. This summons was not attended to. In the year 1218 the prince was summoned to attend at Worcester to do homage to the English king. Llewelyn attended to this summons, and he appeared at Worcester and there swore over the sacred relics to restore the castles of Caermyrddin and Cardigan and the other lands in South Wales to the partisans of the king. He also promised to induce all the Welsh to do homage to Henry. To many persons the conduct of Llewelyn in the might of his power and prosperity, submitting to Henry and paying abject homage to him, seemed strange. Probably he was tired of war, and perceived that under Henry III. the war against the Welsh would be carried on with much greater energy than under the weak John, whose power was limited by civil war and conflicts with the Church.

Llewelyn fulfilled his part of the agreement by persuading the Welsh princes to submit to Henry ; and they were all summoned to attend at Gloucester to render homage to him. Henry seemed fairly satisfied with the conduct of Llewelyn, and as the other

princes had submitted he requested the prince to restore their lands. This was done by him reluctantly and imperfectly. The great earl of Pembroke, marshal of the kingdom and guardian of the young king, and real governor of England, died at this time, and the bishop of Winchester succeeded him. Llewelyn, in 1219, marched into South Wales to oppose the Flemings and others who had seized the fortress of Cardigan. In this campaign, previously described, he had given displeasure to Henry, and this led to war in South Wales, which did not last long. In the year 1221, the king, in returning from South Wales, came through Powys and rebuilt in a stronger form the castle of Montgomery, intended as the other castles to be a check on the Welsh. In connection with this castle we may here mention that in the year 1228 the English garrison of the castle, which was then entrusted to Hubert de Burgh, began to construct a wider road through the large forest which extended some fifteen miles. This, of course, involved the cutting down of many trees and opening of the forest. This forest was often a place of retreat for the Welsh troops, and was also the resort of thieves and brigands. When the workmen were engaged in cutting down the trees, the Welsh suddenly attacked them and drove them into the castle for safety after much loss. Then the Welsh besieged them in the castle. Henry and Hubert de Burgh came to their relief, and the Welsh retired. The king set the forest on fire and destroyed it to a large extent. The royal forces penetrated into the district as far as a place where there was a Carmelite monastery and an abbey belonging to the White Friars. The name of the place was called Cridia by the English, but by the Welsh, Kerry. The place is still known by the same name of Kerry, a pleasant village in Montgomeryshire, a few miles from the county town. The king was informed that this monastery was used by the Welsh as a retreat and a storehouse for their prey ; he, therefore, ordered it to be burnt to the ground. The position was considered a strong one, and with the king's consent a castle was built there by Hubert de Burgh. The construction of this castle by the English army in the middle of a forest occupied the army some months. In the meantime the Welsh army under Llewelyn was watching their opportunity. Foraging parties and convoys were cut off and destroyed. One of Henry's great lords, William de Breos, out on a foraging expedition for the support of the army, was captured and made a prisoner by the troops of Llewelyn. In the midst of a forest district, the supplies cut off, and many of his men slain or imprisoned, Henry came to the conclusion that he would bring the campaign to an end. He made a humiliating peace with Llewelyn, designated by the English chronicler as "a disgraceful peace." Henry was required to destroy the castle he had just erected, and Llewelyn was to pay Henry for the charges of the war, 1,000 marks. Having ratified the treaty, both parties returned home. Thus ended Henry's first expedition. This was in the year 1228.

The lord William de Breos, who was a prisoner in the hands of

Llewelyn, was liberated on the payment of a ransom, said to be 3,000 marks and the castle and territories of Builth, in the year 1229. In the following year, however, William de Breos was again made prisoner by Llewelyn, and on the charge of an intrigue with Llewelyn's wife, who was sister of Henry III., was put to death—probably the charge was invented as an excuse for the execution. The king resented the death of William de Breos, and summoned Llewelyn to Worcester and also to Shrewsbury. Llewelyn did not obey this summons, but replied by marching his army into the Marches and the territory of the late William de Breos. Much injury was inflicted on the inhabitants of the invaded districts. On hearing of these devastations, Henry hastened to the borders with an army, and Llewelyn retired to the mountains. Then Henry returned, leaving a detachment of his army under the justiciary, Hubert de Burgh, to defend the Marches. Another band of Welshmen, on hearing that Henry had returned to England, made an attack on the English forces near Montgomery. The result, as related, was that the Welsh suffered a disaster in which nearly all of them perished. Llewelyn advanced with larger forces, and made a successful assault on the castle of Montgomery, captured the castles of Radnor, Brecknock (or Aberhonddu), and Rhaiadrgwy, and after a long siege took the castle of Caerleon and destroyed it, the garrison perishing in the flames. The destructive war was continued and fluctuated, and then there was a truce. It was agreed that there should be a conference between Henry and Llewelyn. The meeting took place in the summer of 1233 at the ancient town of Shrewsbury. Commissioners were appointed to discuss and settle the questions in dispute between the two princes. They came to the following conclusions : that there should be a mutual restoration of all the estates seized during the war ; that the damages inflicted should be valued by the commissioners and the persons who were to make restitution ; and that any fresh disputes that may arise during the truce should be settled by the same commissioners. These proposals were agreed to by both sides and Llewelyn was obliged to do homage to Henry.

The ruler of Gwynedd had usually been designated as " Prince of North Wales," and held the position of the paramount prince of Wales generally. In the gradual progress of the English conquest his power and position were reduced. And now, in the negotiations carried on between Henry III. and Llewelyn, the latter was called prince of Aberfraw and lord of Snowdon—an indication of the lower position of the prince, and the intention of the English not to recognise the supreme power in Wales of the Welsh prince. In olden times, even as far back as the days of Howal Dda, the then Welsh kingdoms were called after the names of the royal residences. In Gwynedd the royal residence was Aberfraw in Anglesey, and the prince was called the king of Aberfraw. The kingdom of Powys had its royal residence and capital at Mathraval, near Meifod, in Montgomeryshire ; and the kingdom of South Wales had its royal residence at Dinevwr. The kingdoms were

commonly called by these names. In the Venedotian Code the ruler Howel Dda is called king, and in the preface prince of all Cymru; but in the Dimetian Code he is called king of all Cymru. Now in the time of Henry the titles are reduced, and Llewelyn is designated the prince of Aberfraw and the lord of Snowdon.

In the year 1231 the truce was made, and it continued for about two years. In the year 1233 there were complaints of violations of the agreement on both sides. At the same time there arose a dispute between Henry and his English barons. In anticipation of the coming calamities there were many natural signs observed, of course, by a superstitious people, which English and Welsh were in those times. In London tremendous thunders were heard, and there and elsewhere they were repeated, and were attended by torrents of rain which continued during the summer. Strange signs were observed in the sky. These phenomena were afterwards regarded as the prophetic signs of the calamities which followed in the political world. The barons were assembled in London in August of this year to consider the state of the kingdom. Richard, the earl of Pembroke and earl marshal, was among them. He resided there with his sister, the countess of Cornwall, who had married the king's brother. He was informed by his sister that there was a plan to make him a prisoner preliminary to his execution. On being persuaded of this danger he left London by night, accompanied by some other lords. He directed his course to Wales, and entered into an agreement with Llewelyn and other Welsh princes to unite their forces against Henry. The war then began. Thus was formed a conspiracy against the king. The operations in South Wales have been already described. The Marches were invaded and desolated by the confederates. Henry summoned all his dependent princes to meet him at Gloucester on the 14th of August, 1233. Llewelyn and his confederates did not obey the summons. The king, on finding that the confederates were absent, began the war against them as traitors and treated them as outlaws, and proceeded to destroy their castles and to alienate their lands. The king's army consisted of English, Flemings, and French, and they advanced to Hereford, intending to destroy the whole country. From Hay Henry wrote to Llewelyn, and summoned him to an interview with the king's councillors at Colewent. Llewelyn sent a most submissive reply in words, and styled himself "Prince of Aberfraw and Lord of Snowdon." He never, however, appeared, and the war went on. Henry found that Herefordshire had been laid waste, and did not afford supplies to his army, and therefore he retreated on the castle of Grosmont. Here the English army, encamped outside the castle, was attacked during the night and defeated, losing their horses, provisions, baggage, and money, and driven inside the castle for safety. The commander of the confederates on this occasion was the earl of Pembroke. He did not wish to attack the king inside the castle, and retired to a safe

distance. The king was so much confounded by this sudden blow that he returned to Gloucester.

About this time other barons left the cause of the king and joined the confederates. Among these was Hubert de Burgh, the justiciary of England, who was aided to escape from the castle at Devizes, where he was a prisoner held in irons. He directed his course to Wales, where he joined the confederates in the month of October. The war proceeded south and north. In the year 1234 Llewelyn joined the earl marshal in military operations, and spread desolation on the Welsh borders even as far as Shrewsbury, which they partially burnt. Whilst this desolation was going on along the English borders, Henry remained inactive at Gloucester, being in fact without an army of sufficient strength to contend against the confederates. The attempt of John of Monmouth to surprise the confederates under the Earl Marshal had ended in his rout and the invasion of his lands and the capture of his property. The condition of Henry's affairs was now deplorable, and he was persuaded to dismiss his old advisers and ministers, and make peace with the confederates. At this time the parliament was sitting at Westminster, and the members, spiritual and temporal, induced the king to settle the grievances of the kingdom, and to make peace. The archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of Rochester and Chester were sent as an embassy into Wales to treat with Llewelyn and the other confederates. The Earl Marshal was absent in Ireland, engaged in a war against his enemies, where he died. Llewelyn at first was averse to the peace, but finally he agreed, and a treaty of peace was made. The conditions of the treaty were that the confederate nobles should be restored to the king's favour, and their honours and estates secured to them. The king ratified the conditions, and summoned the nobles to appear before him at Gloucester, where they received the kiss of peace, and were reinstated in their rights and estates. Gilbert, the brother of Richard, the Earl Marshal, appeared, and gave evidence that his brother was dead ; on which he was recognised by the king, and received the inheritance, for which he did homage to the king.

The close of the war left Llewelyn in the highest position of honour and power. His eldest son, Gruffydd, had for some reason been a prisoner for six years, but was now released. In the year 1236 complaints were made by Llewelyn to the king that the new earl of Pembroke had broken the conditions of the peace by seizing the castle of Caerleon, belonging to Morgan, its owner. The king replied, expressed his disapproval of the act, and that he had sent commissioners to investigate the affair. In this year died Madoc ab Gruffydd Maelor, who was the lord of Powys Madoc or the Lower Powys. He was interred in the abbey of Llan Egwestle, or the Vale of Crucis, near Llangollen. His son, Gruffydd, succeeded him. The truce between Llewelyn and the king was renewed for another year, and the chiefs were summoned to Tewkesbury to swear to the truce. The arbitrators were appointed on both sides

to settle on principles of reciprocal justice the disputes which had arisen.

In the year 1237 the wife of Llewelyn died, Joan, who was the natural daughter of King John, and sister of Henry III. She desired to be interred on the seashore at the place called Llanvaes in Anglesey. Llewelyn erected over her grave a monastery of Barefooted Friars. This was intended as a sacred memorial to the name of the princess, or, as some said, to please her brother, the king of England. The fame of this princess was stained by accusations against her moral purity, but in all probability she was innocent of the sin; and the conduct of Llewelyn in honouring her in a special manner seemed to show that he was convinced of her innocence.

In the same year Llewelyn summoned all the princes and chiefs of Wales to a conference at Strata Florida, and there the chiefs renewed their homage to Llewelyn. They also did homage to Davydd, the second son, as the successor of Llewelyn. Llewelyn had resolved to set aside his eldest son by the first wife, Gruffydd, and appoint Davydd, his son by Joan, to succeed him. He apprehended civil war after his decease, and he was desirous that the appointment of Davydd should be sanctioned by the Welsh princes. This action of Llewelyn was not agreeable to Henry, and he wrote to both forbidding any homage to be paid to Davydd until he had paid homage to himself as supreme. He therefore summoned Davydd to Worcester to pay homage to him. This he probably did. This was in the year 1238.

The life of Llewelyn was now drawing to a close, and he wished to establish with Henry a permanent peace, and for this purpose he offered to place himself under his protection, and to hold his dominions as a fief of the English crown. Llewelyn was old and infirm, and was afflicted with paralysis. His days of warfare were thus ended. Under these circumstances, Davydd unwisely seized a great portion of the lands belonging to his brother Gruffydd, leaving him only the cantrev of Lleyn in Carnarvonshire. This led to dissensions, and to prevent further conflicts the bishop of Bangor arranged for a meeting of the two brothers. On the way to the place of meeting Gruffydd was arrested under the orders of Davydd, and imprisoned in the castle of Criccieth. This led to a civil war in North Wales. The particulars here mentioned, especially the extent of territory seized by Davydd, were probably exaggerated, but the fact of dissensions was real. Llewelyn died on the 11th of April in the year 1240, after the long reign of fifty-six years. He left two children by his first wife, Tangwystl, namely, Gruffydd and a daughter, Gwladys, who became the wife of Sir Ralph Mortimer, nephew and heir to the earl of Chester. By his second wife, Joan, he had one son, Davydd, who succeeded him. Thus ended the career of Llewelyn ab Iorwerth—the most valiant of Welsh princes. "He brought all Wales to his subjection, and often put his enemies to flight and defended his country." He possessed the requisite qualities for a great warrior and a great

prince. Of his greatness there can be no doubt, but of his personal goodness not much can be said. The goodness of ancient princes was made to consist of contributions to the Church and patronage of the priests, not in the possession and exhibition of the tender, pure, and lofty moral principles of the gospel. He must be judged by the character of his age, which was warlike, cruel, and corrupt. In the higher moral qualities he was equal to those of his times. As a patriot and a leader of men in peace and in war, he was the first of his age. Because of these qualities he was given the illustrious title of *Llewelyn the Great*, and it is under this title that he is known in history. His remains were interred in the abbey of Conway with much honour and amidst the lamentation of his people.

The great Llewelyn was succeeded by his second son, Davydd, the child of Joan, and consequently the nephew of Henry III. The eldest son, Gruffydd, was set aside, and was then a prisoner in the castle of Criccieth. In the month of May, one month after his accession, Davydd proceeded to Gloucester along with Welsh chiefs to do homage to the king of England, Henry III. In this homage he renounced the independence of North Wales, and agreed to hold his dominions as a fief of the king of England. It was agreed that arbitrators should be appointed to settle any disputed questions that might arise in the future, over whom the pope's legate was to preside. In a short time Davydd received another summons from Henry to appear within a week in London, accompanied with the Welsh portion of the body of arbitrators. Davydd did not obey this summons, but in February, 1241, he was summoned to appear at Shrewsbury, either in person or by deputy. This summons was obeyed, and Welsh commissioners were sent to join the body of arbitrators.

The dispute between Davydd and his eldest brother, Gruffydd, remained unsettled. The latter was still in prison. The bishop of Bangor and Lord Mortimer tried to induce Davydd to release his brother, but he refused on the ground of fear. The bishop excommunicated Davydd and induced the pope to confirm his sentence and to place North Wales under an interdict. The bishop escaped to England. The wife of Gruffydd, whose name was Sina, and many Welsh chiefs united with the bishop in inducing Henry to obtain the release of Gruffydd. Henry was persuaded to interfere, and he wrote to Davydd to order him to release his brother, pointing out to him that by doing so he would restore his good name and obtain absolution from the pope. This order Davydd refused to obey, giving as a reason that if his brother were released there would be no peace for his country, such was his fiery nature. This refusal excited the king's displeasure and he resolved to enforce his command. He ordered all his military vassals to meet him at Gloucester. The king sent another communication to his nephew Davydd in which he accused him of bad conduct against Ralph Mortimer, towards Owain Vychan, and Gruffydd ab Madoc of Powys, and

other matters. The army of the king advanced from Gloucester to Shrewsbury, remaining fifteen days, where many Welsh and English vassals met him. Among those who met the king at Shrewsbury was Sina, the wife of the imprisoned Gruffydd. The wife, on behalf of the husband, came to an agreement with the king, promising many things on the condition that Gruffydd and his son Owain should be released from prison. These promises included annual payments to the king for the territory which belonged to him and the observance of the peace with Davydd. These and other promises were agreed to by the assembled Welsh lords and chiefs.

The king then advanced at the head of his army from Shrewsbury towards Chester. This was in the month of August, 1241. The advance was rendered easy by the fact that the summer was a dry and warm one, and the country was easily traversed. Davydd saw the danger before him. The Church was against him—his country was under the papal interdict—and now the English army was approaching. He then changed his mind and sent to the king an offer to release his brother on the condition that he himself should be restored to the king's favour. The king agreed to the proposal, adding that Gruffydd and his son Owain should be delivered to him, and other matters, including the handing over to him the lordships of Ellesmere and Englefield for ever, and to engage never to recede from service to the king and abide by the law in his courts. These conditions were very humiliating for Davydd, and showed how much the country had fallen since the death of Llewelyn the Great. The treaty was signed on behalf of Davydd by the bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph on the 29th of August at Alnet on the river Elwy, near St. Asaph. The Welsh prince also agreed that the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishops of London, Hereford, Coventry, and Ely should become arbitrators between the king and himself. A few months after the signing of the treaty, Davydd proceeded to the court of England and did homage to Henry and then returned to Wales under the safe conduct of the king.

The above treaty was repeated and solemnly confirmed at Rhuddlan in the presence of the king. Gruffydd, after his release, his wife, sons, and attendants were sent to the Tower of London for safe custody, pending the complete settlement of their affairs. Before the king returned from Wales he arranged that Davydd should retain his patrimonial estate. The king also settled the affairs of another Gruffydd of Powys; he restored to him his hereditary rights, and to the sons of Meredydd ab Cynan ab Owain Gwynedd their rights in Meirionydd. Then in the middle of September the king returned to England.

Princes in those days were not remarkable for keeping their promises and fulfilling their engagements. Henry began the late war nominally for the purpose of obtaining the release of Gruffydd from the prison of his brother; but when he, his wife, and son were handed over, they were consigned to the Tower

of London by Henry and kept prisoners. Gruffydd, tired of a second imprisonment, made an attempt to escape by means of a cord, but the cord broke and he fell into the ditch and was killed. The king, to free himself from blame, issued a proclamation to the effect that no one was to blame except the guards. He, however, continued the imprisonment of the son Owain under greater restrictions. This event occurred in the year 1244.

When the death of Gruffydd became known in North Wales, Davydd showed the greatest indignation and began another war of rebellion against Henry. He was joined by many of the Welsh chiefs, but not by those of Powys. He appealed to the pope to aid him by releasing him from his oath of feudal subjection to the English king. It was then a dogma of the Church that the pope as supreme lord of the earth could release princes and peoples from their sworn obligations. Davydd employed money in the negotiations—a power to which the pope and his officers were often subject. Davydd also offered to hold his princedom as a fief of the holy see. All that Davydd could obtain in response to his liberal proposal was the appointment of two Welsh abbots as a court to inquire into the matter and report to the pope. Henry was summoned to appear before the court of abbots, "if expedient to him." Of course, it was not expedient, and he indignantly refused. Henry sent an embassy to the pope, and by larger promises and gifts won over the pope to his side. The king, however, was not content with negotiations with the pope; he began to prepare for war.

In the meantime the Welsh were proceeding with the war and had been successful in their incursions into the Marches and the estates of the English lords. In the king's absence in Scotland he had appointed to carry on the war on his behalf the earls of Hereford and Clare and others. These nobles were not successful in resisting the incursions of the Welsh. These Welsh successes induced Henry to ask his parliament for the financial means of carrying on the war, which were refused. The king began a system of spoliation of the Jews and the London merchants in order to obtain money. In the meantime the war was proceeding in the border districts called the Marches. Powys and Flintshire were scenes of conflict. The Welsh were led into an ambuscade by the commander at Montgomery Castle and three hundred were slain. This great loss led Davydd to invade the district. He was opposed by Herbert Fitz-Mathew at the head of the English troops. He was unacquainted with the country and led his army into a difficult position, where they were suddenly attacked by the Welsh and defeated, and among the slain was the commander, Herbert Fitz-Mathew. The English troops hastily retreated. This led the Welsh to be very courageous in the wasting of the country. They, however, soon after sustained the loss of two hundred men near the castle of Montgomery. Then the prince of Gwynedd was angry and laid siege to the castle of Mold, in Flintshire, which belonged to the earldom of Chester,

and captured it by assault and slew the whole garrison except the governor, Roger de Mont Alto, who happened to be away from the fort at the time of the assault. These savage proceedings increased the fierceness of the war.

In the year 1245 King Henry summoned his Welsh vassals, including Davydd, to appear in his court at Westminster to do homage to him and to explain their late warlike proceedings. Some of them—about twenty—obeyed the summons, but Davydd was not among them. Nevertheless the king empowered two nobles, John of Chester and Henry of Alderley, to negotiate with Davydd with the view of agreeing to a truce. The negotiation failed, the war having proceeded before the messengers arrived. The king now determined to carry on the war earnestly and to place himself at the head of the army. The parliament had granted the necessary supplies. His military vassals were summoned to join the army in July, 1245. The bull of the pope was against the Welsh and in favour of Henry. The justiciary in Ireland was ordered to co-operate by sending an expedition to Anglesey. In the month of August Henry, at the head of his army, marched into North Wales. The Irish troops landed in Anglesey and did much injury, but when loaded with plunder they were attacked by the Welsh and driven back to their ships. The English army was a powerful one and advanced almost unmolested as far as the Conway. The Welsh army under Davydd retired to the mountains and pursued the plan of harassing the English by sudden incursions from the mountains. Henry determined to rebuild the old castle of Diganwy near to his camp on the Conway as a convenient place to resist the incursions of the Welsh. This work took ten weeks to complete, during which the army was encamped on the Conway and acted on the defensive. The winter was now near, the weather became severe, and the difficulty of procuring supplies was very great. The writer, Matthew Paris, makes the remark that the usual price of bread was raised from one farthing to fivepence, a fowl from a small sum to eightpence. In the camp there were only one cask of wine, one ox, and one quarter of corn worth twenty shillings. In these circumstances there was much suffering and there were many losses. The Welsh did not omit to attempt to cut off stragglers and even to attack the camp. The supply of food from Ireland was brought by a ship which grounded on the Anglesey coast, and when the tide retired was found on the strand. The Welsh used their opportunity and tried to capture the contents of the ship, which consisted of more than fifty tuns of wine and much food. Their first attempt was not successful. Finally the men in charge abandoned the vessel and escaped to the English camp, carrying with them only a portion of the cargo; the rest was taken by the Welsh troops.

This campaign of Henry was brought to an end by the completion of the castle of Diganwy, which was garrisoned by many troops and well supplied with provisions. The army then retired

to England, beginning their march on the 29th of October, 1245. There had been no great battle in the course of the campaign. The Welsh retired to the mountains and the English devastated the plains. The former fell upon small detachments and slew them. The latter retaliated, and sometimes followed them part-way up the mountains. They also pillaged and then burnt the abbey of Conway, belonging to the Cistertian Order and the burial-place of some of their princes. This excited the wrath of the Welsh, who came down from the mountains and furiously attacked the English and slew many of them. Acts of cruelty were done on both sides and prisoners were put to death. The losses from the sword and famine were great, and when the English army retired, the country, especially Anglesey, had been laid waste, and famine stared the inhabitants in the face. This devastation extended even to Cheshire, in order that the sources of supplies be cut off from the Welsh and that they may become an easy prey to the English in their next advance. Henry issued orders that no food should be sent into Wales from the Marches, or the borders of England, on pain of death. Even the city of Chester was reduced to a condition bordering on famine, and also the surrounding districts. The territory of the prince of North Wales was practically reduced to Anglesey, Caernarvon, and Merioneth. The condition of the brave inhabitants was deplorable. In this state of things the Welsh princes rallied around their chief prince, Davydd, and gave to him the assurance of their constant allegiance. Davydd, however, was overwhelmed by the miseries of his country and the prospect of still greater calamities. In the year 1246 he fell ill and died in his palace at Aber, in Caernarvonshire, amidst the lamentations of his people after a reign of six years. He was interred at the abbey of Conway, the burial-place of Welsh princes of North Wales. He left behind him no children.

The nobles of North Wales assembled and elected two young men as joint rulers of North Wales. They were Owain and Llewelyn, the sons of Gruffydd ab Llewelyn, who perished in trying to escape from the Tower of London. Owain was then a resident in England, enjoying the favour of Henry, such as it was. He escaped from England into Wales on hearing of the death of his uncle Davydd. Llewelyn had resided in North Wales at Maesmynan, near the village of Caerwys, in Flintshire. In that position he enjoyed the patrimony from his father of Englefield and other cantrevs. The condition of the Welsh people was now very miserable after so many destructive wars. Their trade had been destroyed ; the cultivation of the land had been neglected ; famine and pestilence prevailed. The bishops of Bangor and St. Asaph were obliged to seek relief, as their bishoprics were ruined. The two young princes resolved to make peace with King Henry. The conditions of this peace were humiliating to the Welsh. The king accepted the homage of the princes, and he forgave them the evils they had done. The princes agreed to

surrender for ever the districts which comprised the cantrevs of Englefield, Rhos, Rhyvonioc, and Dyffryn-Clwyd, which extended from Cheshire to the river Conway. They agreed also to find one thousand foot-soldiers and twenty-four horse to serve the king, when called upon, in Wales or in the Marches at their own expense, but only half the number when the service was to be rendered elsewhere. All the princes and chiefs in Wales were to do homage and render service to the king of England in perpetuity. The other portion of North Wales was to be held by the Welsh princes under the crown of England for ever. These and other sworn conditions were agreed to, and the treaty was signed by the two princes. These transactions took place in the year 1247. The remains of the Prince, the father of Owain and Llewelyn, were obtained from England by the intervention of the abbots of Florida Strata and Conway, and were honourably interred in the abbey of Conway.

Peace was now established and remained for a time, and was interrupted first by internal discord. The joint reign of two princes over the diminished Gwynedd was not likely to be successful. Such an arrangement has hardly ever been happy in any country outside Japan. In the year 1254 or 1255 Owain, the elder of the reigning princes, became dissatisfied with the joint arrangement and induced his brother Davydd to unite with him in hostilities against Llewelyn. The two brothers began the war, and with a considerable force entered the field against their brother. The battle took place at a place called Bryn-Derwyn. It was severe, but short and bloody. The victory was gained by Llewelyn, and the hostile brothers were captured and made prisoners. Owain remained for several years a prisoner at Dolbadarn Castle, near the lake of Llanberis. Llewelyn now became the sole reigning prince of Gwynedd and the head of the Welsh chiefs and princes. He ruled for many years, and engaged in many wars against the English. He is known in history as Llewelyn the Second, and brought the independence of Wales to an end.

The king of England, Henry III., did not interfere in the domestic conflicts between Llewelyn and his brothers. The peace of 1247 remained nominally unbroken until the year 1255 or 1256. The conditions of that treaty were found by the Welsh to be burdensome. The English also continually stretched those conditions and imposed heavy burdens on the Welsh, so that the burden seemed intolerable. Edward, the son of Henry, was the chief instrument in the inflicting of the burdens. The lordships of the ceded districts from the Dee to the Conway and the control of the other districts —including the earldom of Chester and the castles of Rhuddlan, Diserth, and Diganwy—were granted to Edward. He had also the castles of Montgomery, Builth, Cardigan, and Caermyrddin. He filled these castles with ruffians and villains, not with well-disciplined soldiers. His own conduct was extremely tyrannical and even cruel. Any offending youth met with was ordered to have

one ear cut off and one eye taken out as instantaneous punishment. The Welsh laws and customs to which the people were attached were abolished, and English laws alone were enforced. Heavy taxes were also imposed upon them. Under these circumstances the Welsh chiefs, failing to obtain any redress, appealed to Llewelyn. They complained that they suffered grievances from Prince Edward and the lords of the Marches, that their estates were taken from them, that they were treated with severity. They declared that they would rather die on the battlefield in defence of their rights than endure any longer such cruel and oppressive treatment. Llewelyn was in sympathy with the chiefs, as his own complaints to the king were unattended to. He and his chiefs were told that they must submit without complaint to their wrongs. The consequence was that the Welsh chiefs under Llewelyn resolved to revolt against the cruel government of the English. This was in the year 1255 or 1256.

Having resolved to revolt, Llewelyn and his chiefs once again united, and commenced operations immediately. He soon gained possession of the inland territory of North Wales, which had been ceded to Henry, and also the district of Meirionydd, and extended his conquests to South Wales and captured Cardigan, belonging to the domain of Edward, the son of Henry, and the castle of Llanbadarn Vawr, and even the territory of Builth. His conquests in South Wales have been described in the previous chapter. Some of the territories thus acquired were conferred on the Welsh princes who had aided in the military operations ; but the district in North Wales called Gwarthrynion Llewelyn retained for himself, from which he had expelled the English lord, Roger Mortimer, who had been a great oppressor of the Welsh. These events occurred in the early winter, and Llewelyn returned victorious to his home in North Wales before Christmas Day.

The English king, the earl of Cornwall, and Edward were too much engaged in the affairs of England to permit them to offer immediate resistance to Llewelyn and the Welsh princes. They tried persuasion, begging Llewelyn to desist from rebellion. The winter was favourable to the Welsh and adverse to the English. It was said also that some of the noble Marchers were hostile to the king and secretly encouraged the Welsh chiefs. It was said that the army of Llewelyn was a large one, consisting of ten thousand armed horsemen and a much greater number of infantry. These figures, given by the Welsh chronicler, were magnified even by Matthew Paris. This writer, a distinguished Benedictine monk of St. Alban's, had access to ancient documents in his position in the monastery. He was a learned man, a mathematician, a poet, a theologian, and historian. He was also a man of integrity. He wrote a history of England in Latin—*Historia Major*. It included the period from the Conquest, 1066, to the year in which he died, 1259. He was, therefore, a contemporary of Henry III. This writer states that Llewelyn, after dispossessing Gruffydd of Powys, divided his army into two parts in order to make the supplies easier, and that each

part consisted of thirty thousand men, of which five hundred were mounted. In all probability the numbers were exaggerated very much—an error which was very common in ancient times. Nevertheless, the army of Llewelyn was a powerful one. The prince of Upper Powys was Gruffydd ab Gwenwynwyn, who had taken the side of the king, and for this offence Llewelyn invaded his territory and seized his lands and drove him from his position as ruler. He fled for safety to England. This prince was also the lord of Dinas Bran. According to the Welsh Chronicle, he resided in the castle of Dinas Bran, near to Llangollen, now usually called Crow Castle, the English rendering of the Welsh. The ruins of this castle are still very conspicuous to the ordinary traveller from the road near to Llangollen. The situation of this castle on the high hill is an indication of the strong positions which the British princes in olden times held, and where they retired for protection against the enemy advancing along the valleys.

The other portion of Powys was also ruled by a prince named Gruffydd ab Madoc, the lord of the Lower Powys. Llewelyn, returning from the campaign in South Wales, engaged the enemy in this part of Powys. The barons of England, aided by one of the two Gruffydds, had advanced to the neighbourhood of Montgomery, where they encamped near the river Severn. Here they offered battle to the Welsh, but when the Welsh in large numbers rushed on, the English fled, and retired on the castle of Montgomery. In this campaign Llewelyn captured the whole of Powys, except some small portions, and the castle of Trallwm, or Pool, known now as Welshpool. Llewelyn was now everywhere triumphant—even in South Wales and Powys. The Gruffydd of Powys Madoc returned to his allegiance to Llewelyn again. Edward, the English prince, was much depressed on account of his losses, and seemed disposed to abandon the attempt to conquer and subdue the Welsh people, though he had previously threatened to "shatter their power like a potter's vessel." In these prosperous circumstances, Llewelyn, in 1258, as reported by Matthew Paris, addressed his followers in a pious spirit, in which he ascribed his victories to God: "The Lord God of hosts hath helped us," said he. The address was animated and confident, and much aroused his people. Many princes in warlike operations have ascribed their successes to the special aid of God and their losses to His displeasure. Many men of thought, however, hesitate to connect the name of the Almighty with the wars and the conflicts of men. The agency of the Infinite Spirit in relation to the affairs of the world and the universe may be mysterious to us, but it is doubtful whether we have any justification for ascribing to God the modes of thought, feeling, and action that belong to finite and imperfect men. The language recorded as used by Llewelyn was probably put into his mouth by the historian reducing to form the substance reported.

Llewelyn had been lately very successful in his military operations, and nearly the whole of Wales recognised his supremacy. The condition of England was one of conflict between the king

and the barons, and this gave the Welsh prince a great advantage. And yet such was the distress resulting from the war in Wales and in England that Llewelyn was disposed towards peace. After several attempts to secure peace, a truce was agreed upon between Henry and the Welsh prince, and was ratified by the commissioners appointed by both sides, who met at the ford of the Severn near the town of Montgomery in the year 1258. This truce was very uncertain, and Henry proposed to assemble an army at Chester, but through the reluctance of the barons it was abandoned and negotiations were resumed. The messengers of Llewelyn received safe conduct to proceed to Oxford and meet the parliament which was appointed to assemble there on the 11th of June, 1258. This was afterwards in English history called the Mad Parliament. The barons appeared with their vassals armed, and the king was practically a prisoner. The head of the barons was Simon de Montfort, the earl of Leicester. The truce previously agreed upon was prolonged for another year until August, 1259. The terms were : each party was to retain what they held ; neither party was to enter the territories of the other ; the fords and passes were to be free from obstruction ; the castles of Diserth and Diganwy were to be allowed to be provided with fresh supplies by sea or land ; the sick among the garrisons were to be replaced by able-bodied men ; violations of the truce were to be rectified at once.

The truce was soon broken in South Wales, of which an account has been given in the last chapter. The success of Llewelyn in South Wales induced Henry at the expiration of the truce to summon his military tenants. The earls of Gloucester and Hereford were required to assemble their troops at Shrewsbury, and the military tenants of the northern and midland districts were ordered to gather their men at the same time,—the 8th of September, 1259—at Chester, and there form a junction with the troops from Shrewsbury. The Church, as usual in those times, joined in the movement, and Llewelyn was excommunicated by the archbishop of Canterbury, and his dominion was threatened with an interdict, unless Llewelyn made reparation for the injuries inflicted. The English army was placed under the command of Simon de Montfort, the earl of Leicester. The season was too far advanced for a long campaign in North Wales in the judgment of Simon, who was considered favourably disposed to the Welsh. He suggested to Henry the desirableness of making peace with Llewelyn. It has also been said that Llewelyn, himself disposed to peace, disavowed the act which was the avowed cause of the war. It was then agreed that commissioners from both sides should assemble to settle the dispute. They assembled at the Montgomery ford, which had more than once been the meeting-place of commissioners of peace. This place, on the river Severn, is a few miles from the town of Montgomery. The truce made by the commissioners was to continue for two years—from 1260 to 1262. Llewelyn had been in South Wales engaged in war, especially against Sir Roger Mortimer. From Brecknock, where he received the oaths of allegiance from

the chiefs and people, he returned to his palace at Aber, in North Wales. The continuance of this truce was of great benefit to the inhabitants of Wales and the border districts. In the early part of the year 1262 Llewelyn desired that the truce should be converted into a permanent peace. He had been very successful in the late wars, but probably he and his people were tired of incessant warfare, and he considered that the time was favourable for making a permanent arrangement by which he might consolidate the advantages he had gained. Nothing came of this proposal, and the war was recommenced. Henry was in this year in France, where he was laid up with illness. There was a report sent to the king that Llewelyn was dead, and this made him less disposed to make a permanent peace. Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, was with the king in France, but he returned to England, and he secretly formed a confederacy of the English barons, and even of Llewelyn, against the king. The king had recovered from his illness and had returned to England, and finding that the military affairs were going against him, he sent to his son Edward, who remained behind in France, sharply ordering him to return to England to place himself at the head of the English army destined to operate against the Welsh.

The war commenced now in earnest. Early in the year 1263 Llewelyn placed himself at the head of a powerful army, said to consist of 30,000 infantry and 300 horsemen. He advanced into the Marches and ravaged the territory of Roger Mortimer, capturing two of his castles. The losses, however, were not on one side only. Mortimer, with the aid of some of the lords of the Marches, attacked separate detachments of the Welsh and slew many of them, the Welsh retaliating in like manner. Such is war everywhere and at all times—mutual slaughter. Llewelyn then marched into the earldom of Chester, and devastated the district which directly belonged to Edward the son of Henry. The king had recalled Edward from France and had issued orders to prepare an expedition against the Welsh. The English troops were ordered to assemble at Hereford and at Ludlow. Edward placed himself at the head of his army and marched into North Wales, and the Welsh retired to the woods on his approach. Edward, however, did nothing of importance, and he was recalled to England to take a prominent part in the war between the king and the English barons which had begun.

The head of the barons was Simon de Montfort, the earl of Leicester. The earl and Llewelyn formed an alliance, and their troops were united in the campaign against the Marches. Bridgenorth surrendered to the confederate forces on the condition that the Welsh soldiers should not be admitted into the town. The town of Shrewsbury opened its gates on the same condition, such was the dread inspired by the warlike and triumphant Welsh. This war on the part of the barons in the Marches continued until June, and then the barons advanced upon London. Llewelyn also during the summer directed his energies against the English

strongholds in North Wales. The strong castles of Diserth and Diganwy were attacked and captured and destroyed. Also the castle of Mold, in Flintshire, was taken by the forces of Gruffydd ab Gwenwynwyn, the prince of Powys, who had again returned to his loyalty to Llewelyn. The boundary of Gwynedd by this successful war was extended to the river Dee, the old limit of the prince of North Wales. The war was now brought to an end by a truce between Henry and Llewelyn. The war in South Wales during this period has been narrated in the previous chapter.

The course of events in Wales was much influenced by the war between Henry and the barons. The alliance between the earl of Leicester, the chief of the barons, and Llewelyn was one result of this civil war—an alliance of convenience on both sides. By the battle of Lewes the cause of the king was entirely destroyed, and the king himself and his brother were made prisoners, and Prince Edward afterwards surrendered. Simon de Montfort became the actual ruler of the kingdom. Prince Edward was kept a prisoner at Hereford, and the king himself was in the power of De Montfort. In 1265 he called a parliament in London which in English history has been called the first meeting of the House of Commons. Prince Edward escaped from prison and rallied the royal party. A fresh war was begun, and the great battle of Evesham ended by the death of the earl of Leicester and the triumph of the cause of the king. In the meantime the contest was carried on in the Marches between the partisans of Llewelyn, the lords of the Marches, and the supporters of the earl of Leicester. The leader of the cause of the king in these districts was Sir Roger Mortimer, whose estates were ravaged and castles captured. The lord marchers had been defeated by Leicester, and a treaty of peace was made at Hereford by Leicester and Llewelyn. This was, of course, before the battle of Evesham. As an illustration of the fluctuations of parties, it may be mentioned that the brother of Llewelyn, Davydd, changed his alliance from his brother to the king of England, and fled into England and joined the royal forces, but was defeated in a battle near Chester. In the conflict in the Marches the royal forces were victorious from Hereford to Chester against the followers of Simon de Montfort, and this led the earl to seek the alliance and the aid of Llewelyn, which was granted on the condition that his sovereignty of Wales should be restored to him. This was granted by the earl under the sanction of the king, who was then under his power. He was also granted the lordship of Whittington, the cantrev of Ellesmere, and the castles of Hawarden and Montgomery. This is narrated in the works of the author, Thomas Rymer, which consisted of a number of public treatises, published from the year 1704 to 1713, when he died. The name of his works in Latin was "Federa conventiones, et cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica inter Reges Angliæ et Alios principes." The author was an English antiquarian, and was royal historiographer from 1692 to 1713, a position which gave him the

opportunity of studying ancient documents, and enabled him to compile a work which has been a treasury of historical information.

Simon de Montfort, the earl of Leicester, in order to bind Llewelyn to his cause, offered him his daughter Eleanor in marriage, which was accepted. She was also niece to Henry III. The marriage, however, was postponed, and Eleanor was for some years detained at court by Edward, but in the year 1278 the marriage took place, and Eleanor and Llewelyn returned to Wales. The influence of Eleanor on the English and Welsh princes was favourable to peace, but unfortunately she died in childbed in the year 1280, and thus the only tie between the English king and Llewelyn was destroyed.

The victory of the royal army at the battle of Evesham in the year 1265, in which the earl of Leicester was killed, opened up a new condition of public affairs for England and Wales. The prospects of independence and power to Llewelyn and the Welsh, created by the favourable conditions granted by Leicester in the treaty recently agreed to, were clouded by the defeat and death of the earl. King Henry was liberated from his virtual bondage to the powerful earl. The English barons soon after laid down their arms and submitted to the king under the moderate terms granted to them, and peace was established in England. The king, however, did not regard Llewelyn and the Welsh with a favourable mind. The Welsh troops aided Simon de Montfort in his rebellion, and were present at the decisive battle of Evesham, when they fled from the field very early and were pursued and many of them slain by the royal troops.

Before the army was disbanded after the battle of Evesham, Henry decided to begin a war against the Welsh, and he assembled his army at Shrewsbury. Llewelyn was not prepared or disposed for war, and he sought from Henry a peace on honourable terms and offered submission. This was secured by the mediation of the pope's legate, though a short time previously he had in the pope's name required Llewelyn to restore the castles he had taken and to sever his connection with the confederate barons. This treaty was made in the year 1267, and under the circumstances the conditions were favourable to Llewelyn. Llewelyn was to be recognised as the prince of Wales, was to receive the homage of the Welsh princes except one, Meredydd ab Rhys, chief prince in South Wales; the four inland cantrefs in North Wales were to be held by him. On the other hand Llewelyn and his successors were to swear fealty to the English king and his successors, and do homage, and to pay 25,000 marks to him in instalments. The recent acquisitions of lands and castles were to be given up on certain conditions. This treaty was arranged by representatives of the king and Llewelyn. Henry was at Shrewsbury, and on the 25th of September, 1267, gave his assent to the conditions agreed to by his commissioners, the pope's legate, and certain barons. It was arranged that the ratification of the treaty should be effected at Montgomery on Michaelmas day, 29th of September. On this day

Henry the king was there, and Llewelyn also, the prince of Wales, each attended by a train of principal men. The two men, formerly enemies, now met in peace. The two rulers with hands enclosed within each other's, went through the ceremony of ratifying the treaty. Llewelyn, kneeling before the king, swore to be Henry's faithful liege man, and then placed at the foot of the deed the stamp of his seal bearing his effigy and the declaration in Latin. The sanction of the pope was given to the treaty in accordance with the usages of the times when priestly power was supreme. This treaty was substantially observed for a few years, but there were some practical difficulties in the application of the details and the adjustment of claims. In the year 1268 Henry appointed bishops and dignitaries of the Church and certain nobles to visit the ford of Montgomery in the month of September to settle all matters pertaining to the treaty. In the year 1269 Edward, the king's son, and others were commissioned by the king to proceed to the same Montgomery ford to adjudicate upon all the complaints arising out of the treaty. Prince Edward at the same time was invested with the charge of the town of Shrewsbury. The duties of this office were discharged by his appointed deputies, as he proceeded about the same time on a crusade to Palestine. In South Wales disputes arose in the year 1269 or 1270 between the earl of Gloucester and Llewelyn. King Henry appointed the earl of Warwick, two bishops (of Coventry and Worcester), and others to proceed to the ford of Montgomery to meet the deputies of Llewelyn for the purpose of settling the disputes—the earl of Gloucester and Llewelyn being summoned to appear in person or by competent representatives. In the meantime Llewelyn had an army prepared to invade the territory of the earl of Gloucester and to occupy and destroy the castle of Caerphilly. By great efforts the bishops of Worcester, Lichfield, and Coventry persuaded Llewelyn to abandon the siege, and to allow the bishops as men of peace to occupy the castle until the dispute was settled. The meeting of these representatives was finally fixed for July, 1272. Afterwards the conference was postponed and, in fact, never came off. The king tried to persuade both parties to abstain from hostilities.

The old king had brought peace to England, and was trying to reconcile the contending parties in Wales and in the Marches, when on the 16th of November, 1272, at Bury St. Edmund's, he died, in the fifty-seventh year of his reign and the sixty-sixth year of his age. His son and heir, Edward, was then away from England engaged in the Crusades, but was on his return home. He first heard of his father's death when he landed in Sicily, but finding that the country was peaceful and the regency was established consisting of the archbishop of York and the earls of Cornwall and Gloucester, he delayed in Sicily and France, and landed in England at Dover in August, 1274, and was crowned on the 19th of August at Westminster by the archbishop of Canterbury.

Soon after the death of Henry, the regency summoned Llewelyn to appear at the ford of Montgomery to pay his homage to the new king through the agents—two abbots—appointed to receive it. He had recently sent his annual payment of 3,000 marks as an acknowledgment of his vassalage ; but he paid no attention to the summons to appear at Montgomery Ford on the 20th of January, 1273. Soon after the return of Edward, Llewelyn again received a summons to appear at Shrewsbury to renew his homage to the English monarch. Llewelyn was distrustful of Edward and refused to attend unless hostages were given for his safety, to consist of such distinguished persons as the king's brother Edmund, the earl of Gloucester, and the chief justice of England. There are some doubts respecting the persons and the occasion of this demand of hostages. There was, however, just ground for Llewelyn's distrust. The two brothers of Llewelyn—Davydd and Roderic—who had opposed the prince of Wales, had fled to England, and were then under the protection of Edward. The lord of Powys, Gruffydd ab Gwenwynwyn, fled to England and was cordially received by Edward. These circumstances justified Llewelyn in his suspicions. He was not also unmindful of the fate of his father, a prisoner in the Tower of London. In the year 1275 Edward proceeded to Chester, and Llewelyn had been summoned to appear there on the 29th of August, 1275, to do homage to the king and to take the oath of allegiance. Llewelyn did not appear in person, but sent by messengers "frivolous excuses," though he had been offered safe conduct. Such was the account given by Edward in a document designated by some historians his "Manifesto."

Edward left Chester and sent a summons to Llewelyn to appear at Westminster soon after Michaelmas in the same year. Llewelyn again disobeyed the summons. In a letter to Gregory, the pope, dated from Treddyn, in Flintshire, Llewelyn made several charges against Edward for his conduct towards him—these constituting reasons for his refusal to obey the summons to appear before the king. He was again summoned to appear at Winchester, in January, 1276, but did not obey. About this time the Welsh prince demanded the fulfilment of the promise of Eleanor, the daughter of Simon de Montford, earl of Leicester, to be his wife. She was then in France under the guardianship of her mother. The messengers sent by Llewelyn to demand the fair princess also addressed the king of France, Philip, whose consent was necessary. They also negotiated a treaty of alliance between Philip and Llewelyn. The princess was willing to fulfil the agreement of her father when she was young, and the mother and the French king consented. The princess left France for Wales escorted by four ships and a large retinue, including her brother Amaury. On the voyage, near the Scilly Islands, the whole company and their ships were captured by the ships of Edward. The princess was detained in the English court in honourable attendance on the queen, and her brother was imprisoned in Corfe and Sherburn castles, where he remained until 1282, and then released only by the pope's inter-

vention. The king of England was cousin to the princess and considered that his consent was necessary. However, the marriage was effected, as previously described.

In the meantime hostilities had commenced in the Marches. The archbishop of Canterbury, other bishops, and barons were permitted to try to induce Llewelyn to submit and pay the homage required. The archbishop of Canterbury went into Wales to press the prince to submit. Llewelyn was obdurate and the attempt failed. Nevertheless Llewelyn sent a letter to the king to say that he was willing to go to Montgomery or to the White Monastery at Oswestry to do homage, on condition that his safety, going and coming, would be guaranteed under the sanction of certain bishops and barons, and that the treaty made with Henry III. should be confirmed, and that Eleanor should be surrendered to him. These moderate terms were rejected by the king and by the parliament then sitting at Westminster, which with assumed indignation granted supplies to enable the king to carry on the war for the entire subjugation of Llewelyn and the Welsh. In the court at Westminster, the king being present, the council consisting of judges, bishops, earls, and barons, sentence for contumacy was pronounced against Llewelyn. It was resolved to summon all the military tenants of the king to assemble at Worcester for an expedition into Wales. Thus war was commenced which doubtless had long been determined upon. This was on the 12th of November, 1276. Immediately after this council meeting the archbishop of Canterbury and other bishops wrote to Llewelyn and addressed him as, "The Noble man, Llewelyn, Prince of Wales and Lord of Snowdon," exhorted him to manifest a sounder spirit of wisdom, and warned him against the consequences of continued disobedience, that he would incur the penalty of excommunication unless within fourteen days after the receipt of the letter he submitted. Llewelyn did not obey the mandates of the king or of the bishops who acted on his behalf. In a few months afterwards he was excommunicated and his country placed under an interdict. The priests, as usual, meddled in the affairs of State and sided with the power likely to be most favourable to the Church of Rome.

Preparations were made for the war. Roger Mortimer was appointed commander in the Marches with which he was connected, namely, our Shropshire and Herefordshire ; and William Beauchamp for Cheshire. The military vassals of the king were required to assemble at Worcester on the 1st of July, 1277. The king began his campaign by instructing his commanders to induce the Welsh chiefs to abandon Llewelyn and submit to him. In this he succeeded to a certain extent. The chiefs of South Wales, led by Rhys ab Meredydd, came over to the side of the king, as previously described. Even the brother of Llewelyn, Davydd, passed over and was in the king's camp, having on certain conditions formed an alliance with Edward. This was a further evidence of the disunited condition of the Welsh princes and their people and a sure indication of their final conquest. The prince of North Wales was for

many ages recognised as the head ruler of the entire people, but there were so many chiefs, principalities, lordships, and tribes that harmony and subordination could with difficulty be maintained. Jealousy and ambition so often prevailed that in important crises of national affairs the nominal union failed and defeat was the consequence. Such was the case at this important period when Edward was preparing for the complete and final conquest of the country. It always has been and always will be. That form of government shared by a number of semi-independent rulers designated in modern times by the term "Home Rule" has never secured that unity which is necessary to the strength and power of a people in times of difficulty and peril. The Welsh people, homogeneous in nature, were divided into many fragments which may be described as *disjecta membra*, and therefore weak, and ultimately conquered and subjugated. This form of government by tribes and clans belonged to all peoples in very ancient times, but those peoples that retained this semi-barbarous mode of national life too long were fated to be subdued by a more united people. Any modern proposal to go back to this state of things amongst modern peoples is a retrograde proposal—a return to one of the features of semi-barbarism. The operation of this principle amongst the ancient Britons was fatal to their independence and ought to be a warning to modern nations. The history of ancient peoples has been either the concentration of separate tribes and provincial governments into a compact whole, giving unity and power and triumph, or the maintenance of their separate little states, which has ended in their loss of independence and their absorption into another greater people. It is probable that if the ancient Britons had been one compact people, possessing a national unity under one government, they would not have been subdued by the Romans, the Anglo-Saxons, or the Normans. This, however, is now mere speculation on the events of the past.

King Edward placed himself at the head of his army in the summer of 1277 and proceeded to Chester, where he waited for the arrival of all his troops. In the meantime the court of the exchequer and the king's court were by the king's command removed from Westminster to Shrewsbury in order to be near the king, so that the business of the State be attended to and the means of carrying on the war may be the more easily supplied. Then the king advanced from Chester, encamping at Saltney Marsh on his journey. A road was constructed from Cheshire through the dense forest that extended in the direction of the Snowdon district, where Llewelyn had retired. This road was constructed by the aid of the country people who joined him in his advance. We know that there were divisions among the Welsh people, for the prince of Wales's brother, Davydd, was then in Edward's camp, and on certain conditions had formed an alliance with him. Flint and Rhuddlan castles were entered by the English forces without any difficulty. The former was rebuilt and latter fortified. The king did not judge it prudent to follow Llewelyn into the mountains of

Snowdon, but contrived to cut him off from his supplies. Anglesey in former wars was the place from which the Britons drew their supplies of food when encamped amidst the hills of Snowdonia. Edward, however, before beginning his campaign, had prepared a fleet to proceed from the Cinque Ports to attack the island. They succeeded in capturing and occupying the island, thereby cutting Llewelyn and his army away from their supplies. In these circumstances Llewelyn and his army had the prospect of starvation in the winter now beginning. The Welsh prince then proposed to Edward terms of agreement, and a treaty was agreed upon and ratified November 10, 1277, at Conway. The conditions of the treaty were, according to Rymer, substantially: that Llewelyn should submit to the king, should pay £50,000 as a penalty for disobedience, that he should surrender the four cantrevs for ever—these being Rhos, including the strong castle of Diganwy; Rhyvoniog, including Denbigh; Tegengl, embracing Rhuddlan; and Dyffryn Clwyd, including the castle of Rhuthyn. The prisoners held by Llewelyn should be released and the adherents of the English should be restored to the estates they held before the war. The island of Anglesey was to be restored to Llewelyn on the payment of 1,000 marks annually. The princes imprisoned by Llewelyn for taking the side of the king were to be released; the five barons of Snowdon were to acknowledge Llewelyn as their lord during *his life;* that Llewelyn should have the title of prince of Wales during his life. The prince after the release from the censures of the Church was to pay homage to Edward at Rhuddlan, and he was every Christmas to do homage to Edward in London; that ten hostages should be given up as security for the due performance of the treaty, and Llewelyn and twenty Welsh chiefs should every year in England take their oath for the due observance of the treaty. There were some other conditions relating to his treatment of his brothers, who had been disloyal to him. His brother Davydd had taken sides with the king against himself and was rewarded by Edward by being made a knight, had received in marriage Eleanor, the handsome widowed daughter of the earl of Derby, and had the gift of Frodsham, in Cheshire, and was made the keeper of all the king's castles in North Wales. These favours and honours conferred on Davydd were very offensive to Llewelyn, against whom he had rebelled. There were other arrangements made for carrying out the conditions of the treaty and for settling disputes that might arise, as recorded in the Welsh Chronicles and in Rymer's valuable books.

The following Christmas was appointed for the solemn act of homage to the king in London by Llewelyn and his chiefs, and they attended under the protection of the king and in charge of a bishop and four noblemen. During their stay in London messengers from the prince of Wales were permitted to have an interview with Eleanor de Montfort at Windsor, and arrangements were made for her promised marriage with Llewelyn. Edward, influenced by the king of France, consented to the marriage, as

previously described. This was in January, 1278. In this year some differences arose between Llewelyn and the king, arising from the proceedings of the commissioners appointed to arbitrate in the matters pertaining to the treaty. The irritation, however, passed away and the truce was renewed. The visit of the Welsh chiefs to London at Christmas was not a pleasant one : the food they had supplied to them did not suit them ; and the inhabitants of Islington, where they resided, followed them in the streets and ridiculed them on account of their strange dress and barbarous appearance. These things made an unfavourable impression, and they returned to Wales with a bad feeling towards the English.

At this time there prevailed among the Welsh a strange delusion, of course a superstition fostered by the bards, that the noted British prince and king, Arthur, who had been dead for centuries, was still alive, and that he would one day return and restore to the Welsh their ancient kingdom. The history of Arthur is largely mythical, constructed by the bards ; though the reality of his existence can scarcely be doubted. The existence of such an idea, or expectation, exerted a powerful influence on the minds of the people and was considered the source of possible danger amongst a poetic and enthusiastic people. To remove this danger, Edward went to Glastonbury, where Arthur was supposed to be interred ; and under the pretence of doing honour to the ancient British king, he had his remains taken out of the coffin, exposed to public view, and reinterred with the remains of his queen Gweniver near to the high altar amidst much ceremonial. An inscription was placed on the coffin testifying that these were the remains of King Arthur, and had been seen by several noblemen and clergy, including the bishop of Norwich. The purpose of this ceremony was, of course, to destroy the idea that Arthur was still alive, and thereby to extinguish the British expectation of his return to set up again the British kingdom. Whether it answered this purpose we are not able to say.

After some negotiations and explanations of misunderstandings between the king and the prince of Wales, by which apparently all was made smooth in Wales and in the Marches, Edward being at or near Chester, gave up freely his right to have ten hostages from Llewelyn, and in September, 1278, he set them at liberty. Then on the 13th of October of the same year the ceremony of marriage between Llewelyn and Eleanor de Montfort took place at Worcester. The king and queen were present and paid the expenses of the ceremony. The king, however, took advantage of the occasion to press Llewelyn to agree to certain stringent stipulations which were inconsistent with his position as prince of Wales. The marriage over, Llewelyn conducted his bride to his palace at Aber, North Wales. His feelings towards the king were much irritated by his harsh treatment during the time of the marriage ceremonies at Worcester. Nothing, however, of an unpleasant nature occurred for two or three years between them after the marriage. In the year 1281 the princess, the wife of

Llewelyn, died in childbed, to the great grief of Llewelyn. The child was subsequently taken to England by order of the king and was placed in the convent of Sempringham. The name of this princess is given differently by different authorities. She is called by some Gwenddolen, and by others Catharine Lackland. The former is more Welsh. The account of her subsequent history has been related variously. According to one account she spent fifty-four years in the convent, but according to another doubtful account she was married to Malcolm, earl of Fife.

The death of the princess of Wales, who was cousin of King Edward, broke the only link between Llewelyn and the king of England. There had been disputes between them owing to the decisions of the justiciaries sent by the king into Wales and the Marches. There was a dispute between Llewelyn and Gruffydd ab Gwenwynwyn of Powys. Llewelyn was summoned to Montgomery to hear the suit; he refused to attend on the ground that it was contrary to the treaty and the customs of Wales. The disputes between the two rulers proceeded. Llewelyn and his brother Davydd, formerly antagonistic, came to an agreement to unite in the war against Edward. The whole of Wales seemed in a state of excitement produced by the oppression of Edward and his representatives. In South Wales as well as in the north the Welsh people rose in arms, and entered enthusiastically into their final conflict for freedom and independence. In South Wales, as previously narrated, Rhys Vychan, the son of Rhys ab Maelgwn, and Gruffydd ab Meredydd ab Owain, and his brother Cynan, and other young princes suddenly attacked and captured the castles held by the king's representatives, including that of Aberystwith. They spread over and ravaged our Cardiganshire and Caermarthenshire. In North Wales the movement, or rebellion as some call it, was begun by Davydd, the brother of Llewelyn. On the 22nd of March, 1282, he placed himself at the head of a band of brave men, and suddenly during the dark and stormy night he surprised the castle of Hawarden and captured it. The governor on behalf of the king, Roger de Clifford, was in bed, and during the struggle was mortally wounded and carried off as a prisoner to the region of Snowdon. The other leaders were slain in the nightly conflict. The two brothers then united their forces and directed their energies against the remaining strongholds of the king in North Wales. These were the castles of Flint and Rhuddlan, which were besieged, and the numerous workmen engaged in the outside works were slain. The castle of Rhuddlan, however, was not captured; but later on the Welsh had to raise the siege on the approach of Edward.

When this outbreak occurred, Edward was at Devizes, where he had gone to celebrate Easter. On receiving the unexpected tidings of the rebellion, he resolved to enter upon the war with the intention of entirely conquering the country and destroying the troublesome spirit of Welsh patriotism and nationality. In order to effect this, he gave up all other enterprises and concentrated

his energies on this one main object. He sent at once a small force to the Marches, where the "rebels" had been troublesome, to keep the enemy in check until the English army should arrive. The king sent to the archbishop of Canterbury a letter requiring him to pronounce sentence of excommunication against the Welsh rebels as aid to the secular sword. He arranged that monks and priests of various grades should sing masses and psalms to propitiate heaven in favour of the English royal family and arms in the war against the Welsh. Princes and rulers have usually obtained the spiritual forces of "the Church" in their wars, even in support of the most unrighteous and cruel cause.

Edward sought and obtained auxiliaries from all parts of his dominions, even from Scotland and from France, as testified by Matthew of Westminster and Thomas Rymer. The English fleet of the Cinque Ports was again ordered to aid in the expedition for the entire conquest of Wales. Contributions of money from the usual sources were required, including the clergy, and money was borrowed from the trading towns. The barons of the exchequer and the judges of the king's bench were required to meet at Shrewsbury to be near the scene of military operations. These were the preparations made by Edward for this final war of conquest.

The king sent his orders to his military vassals from Worcester to assemble their contingents at Rhuddlan by the 2nd of August. He began his march towards North Wales. He arrived at Chester at the beginning of June, where his army rested for a fortnight. The castle of Hope, not far distant, might be a source of trouble in the advance through North Wales. Edward resolved to invest and capture it. It was then held by Davydd, Llewelyn's brother. The place was immediately seized, indeed was surrendered without any serious attempt to defend it. The army of Edward then advanced and drove before them the Welsh troops from the plains towards the mountains. On the approach of the English army, the siege of Rhuddlan Castle was raised by the Welsh, who retreated towards the mountains of Snowdon, but slowly and cautiously. This led the English army to be over-confident. A band of young knights with their soldiers advanced too far and fell into an ambuscade prepared for them by the Welsh, and most of them perished, including William de Valence, heir of Pembroke, Richard de Argenton, and others. According to Welsh authorities this defeat was so serious that Edward was obliged to return to Hope Castle. The engagement, however, was only a skirmish, which was annoying to the king, but had no serious effect on the progress of the campaign. The English army advanced, and we find that Edward resided in the castle of Rhuddlan in the month of July. From here he sent to the sheriffs of several counties to supply him with a number of men skilled in the felling of trees and clearing woods, each to be furnished with a good axe. The object of this order was evidently to clear the woody district and open up the way to the mountains, where the Welsh army was entrenched.

During some part of the war the archbishop of Canterbury came forward as a mediator between Edward and the Welsh. He made two visits to Llewelyn and the army. The first was on his own authority, acting as a friend of both parties. It was said that he went to Llewelyn without the consent of Edward, and even against his will. The second visit, on the 3rd of November, 1282, was with the sanction of the king. His aim was to induce Llewelyn and his followers to submit to the king of England. The message of the archbishop was expressed in a written document which contained seventeen articles. In these articles he expressed his own desire for the temporal and the spiritual welfare of the Welsh people and princes, and he exhorted them very earnestly to agree with the king quickly. He also threatened them with the displeasure of the pope and the power of the king ; he charged them with cruelty in carrying on the war, and sin in beginning the war in Lent ; he promised to present their grievances to the king if they would state them. He exhorted them to repentance and submission, and intimated that unless peace were shortly made they would be proceeded against under the sanction of the barons, the Church, and the people. The mission of the archbishop was not successful. Llewelyn on behalf of the Welsh replied to the effect that he was ready to make peace with the king and submit in all things except the renunciation of their national rights and laws. The charges made against him and his people he explained, and presented a series of charges against the English judges and sheriffs and other representatives of the king. There can be no doubt that the technical conditions of previous treaties and agreements had been broken by both sides. The conduct of the English barons in the Marches had generally been tyrannical and cruel, and often led to cruel retaliation ; but the aim of the English kings was finally to conquer the whole of Wales and incorporate it with the kingdom of England.

The archbishop conveyed the answer of Llewelyn to the king, and desired him to consider the complaints presented. Edward answered that he was desirous of doing justice to the Welsh people, and was willing, on the request of the archbishop, to receive the complaints personally and hear their grievances from their own lips, and that they might freely and safely come and return if *in justice they ought to return in safety*. Llewelyn and his chiefs would not accept such an ambiguous response, though pressed upon them by the archbishop. The answer of Edward was that the Welsh must submit absolutely, and the conditions of the settlement were expressed in certain articles sent to them, and the archbishop tried to induce them to submit to the king. The articles presented to Llewelyn by the king after the English nobles had been consulted involved the entire surrender of Llewelyn and the submission of the whole of the country. The four cantrevs previously described and so often the object of desire and contention were not to be questioned in the negotiation as part of Edward's dominion ; that the island of Anglesey must remain in

the possession of England; that Llewelyn was to surrender Snowdon peaceably, and, of course, thereby submit absolutely to the king; that if he surrendered the barons would persuade the king to grant him a barony in England worth one thousand pounds per annum, that his daughter should be provided for honourably; that should he marry again and have a son, they would endeavour to secure that barony for him and his heirs for ever. According to some authorities, these articles were submitted to Llewelyn in private, but this is uncertain. The brother of Llewelyn, Davydd, was promised to be provided for according to his rank and also his family, if he would leave the country and take the cross or become a crusader, and never again return without the consent of the king. These terms were presented through the medium of a Welshman who was known as Brother John. They were harsh and oppressive, and were equivalent to the entire surrender of princes and people to the king of England and the incorporation of Wales with England. The proposals were rejected by Llewelyn, who during the negotiation resided at his palace at Aber. The substance of these negotiations only is here given. The archbishop of Canterbury replied to Llewelyn, criticised his historical references, defended the king's character against the charges made, and exhorted the Welsh to change their manners and conduct themselves better among themselves towards the Church and the king.

The war recommenced after these negotiations ended in November, 1282. The king issued orders to his military tenants to assemble their troops in December so as to be prepared to begin the campaign in South and North against Llewelyn in January, 1283. In the meantime Llewelyn was not inactive. The king of England had removed his headquarters from Rhuddlan to Conway, near which he placed his army. His cavalry had been placed at the foot of the mountains with the object of cutting off the Welsh army from their sources of supply. The navy of Edward from the Cinque Ports had previously arrived on the coast of Anglesey and had landed troops and occupied the country, not entirely against the will of the inhabitants, as some of the chiefs supported the cause of the king. It was, however, desirable for Edward's cause that the troops in Anglesey should cross the Menai Straits and aid the royal army in its projected attack on the main army of Llewelyn encamped in the mountains of Snowdon in a strong position capable of protecting 20,000 men. Preparations were made for crossing the straits in the narrowest place somewhere nearly opposite to Bangor. The English troops here formed a bridge of boats fastened together by chains, and planks were placed over the boats so that sixty men might march in front. So it was reported, but probably the account was an exaggeration. Whilst the bridge was in course of construction, some English soldiers and their French and Spanish allies passed over the straits during low tide to aid probably in the construction on the other side and to display their own valour. The movement was observed

by the Welsh, and the commander of their troops in that district, named Richard ab Walwyn, allowed the English to cross and advance some distance from the straits, and then when the tide had risen to its height ordered his troops to proceed from their concealed entrenchments and attack them when their retreat over the straits was cut off. The assault made with loud cries was furious and overwhelming; many were slain and others drowned in trying to cross the stream. According to the usual authorities, fifteen knights, thirty-two esquires, and one thousand men perished in this attack. Some important men on the English side perished, including Lucas de Taney, William de Dodingeseles, and William de la Zouch, belonging to the foreign troops. According to some authorities, such as Holinshead, the loss of men was not so great —only two hundred, not one thousand. This local disaster was a check to the progress of the campaign, and increased the difficulties of the king by dividing his army into two when the winter was advancing. The Welsh were encouraged and even elated, and regarded this success as an indication of future triumph. The prophecy of Merlin, which came into mind now as formerly, excited their hopes that Llewelyn should again wield the sceptre of Brutus, the mythical founder of the British nation. This, no doubt, was superstition, but it was not much worse than what we observe in England in modern times when Christian prophets apply their ingenuity in the interpretation and application of Biblical prophecy whenever any crisis arises in the affairs of England and her empire, or in Europe generally.

In the beginning of December Llewelyn left his strong camp amidst the Snowdon hills, placing his brother in supreme command there, and advanced into South Wales to aid the national cause against the English, who, under the command of the earl of Gloucester and Sir Edmund Mortimer, had ravaged the country and gained the great victory of Landeilo Vawr. Llewelyn proceeded with a considerable army through Cardiganshire and Caermarthenshire and was entirely successful, sweeping all before him. Turning round from that region with the probable intention of going back to North Wales to lead his troops against Edward, he arrived in the district of Builth, where he had arranged to hold a conference with some of the chiefs of that country. There he posted the main body of his army on an eminence near the river Wye and placed a guard at the bridge of Pont Orewyn, which was the only way over the river. Then, as the story goes, he went into the valley unarmed and attended by only one person to meet the barons or chiefs of that district as previously arranged. Whilst Llewelyn waited in a small grove for the conference, the guard at the bridge was attacked by a body of men led by John Gifford and Edmund Mortimer, but the Welshmen held the bridge. Then under the guidance of a native whose name was Helias Walwyn, the English forces under Edmund Mortimer were able to cross the river by a ford some distance below the bridge. The excitement produced by this movement led Llewelyn to leave

his hiding place, and finding that the enemy had crossed the river and overpowered the guard on the bridge, he and his attendant fled in the direction of the main body of the army. On the way he was overtaken by one of Edmund Mortimer's knights, whose name was Adam de Francton, and was slain by his lance without any knowledge of the quality of the victim. Different accounts have been given of the way in which Llewelyn came to his end, but the above must suffice. The knight returned to the place where the victim was, still not dead. Then he made the discovery that he was Llewelyn, the prince of Wales; he cut off his head and carried it as the greatest trophy. The head was conveyed to Edward, who was then at Rhuddlan Castle. The body could not be interred in consecrated ground because Llewelyn had died under the ban of excommunication. This, then, was considered of great importance, though now our greatest heroes are interred on the battlefield without any such consecration. The place where he fell was afterwards called Cwm Llewelyn, and the body was interred at a place called Cwmbedd Llewelyn, near the river Irvon.

It was considered probable that Llewelyn was betrayed by the chiefs of the district—the cantrev of Builth. After his death the English army advanced against the Welshmen planted on the eminence called in some documents Mochryd, about three miles from Builth. A sharp battle ensued and continued about three hours, but the Welsh were defeated, losing 2,000 men, estimated as one-third of their army. This battle took place on the 11th of December, 1282.

Thus ended somewhat ingloriously the career of one of the two greatest princes of Wales, rulers of Gwynedd, and warriors that bore the name of Llewelyn. The first was Llewelyn ab Iorwerth, designated the *Great*, who raised North Wales to power and influence during the long reign of nearly fifty years. The second was Llewelyn ab Gruffydd, the grandson of Llewelyn the Great, who reigned forty-six years and was nearly as great a ruler and warrior as his distinguished grandfather. But the times were unfavourable to him, and with him fell the independence of Wales. The character of the age may be inferred from many facts, and from two especially. The head of the fallen prince was taken to Edward, then at Rhuddlan, and by him sent to London, and was received by the inhabitants with trumpets and shouting, and then placed one day in the city pillory, and then borne on the point of a lance through Cheapside and finally placed over the gateway of the Tower. The rest of his body was denied a consecrated interment on the ground that he died under the ban of the Church. This privilege was ultimately granted on the earnest request of a lady, Matilda Longespée, but only after absolution had been granted by the archbishop of Canterbury under the representation that he had desired the services of a priest when dying. In the superstition of the age the eternal destiny of the soul depended on the place where the body was interred and the ceremony performed.

The people of Wales mourned the death of their prince—the last great hope for their freedom and independence. "The voice of lamentation is heard in every place," was a poetical description of the popular feeling.

Davydd, the brother of Llewelyn, succeeded to the nominal position of ruler of Gwynedd and prince of Wales. It was only nominal. He was in the possession of the Welsh strongholds in North Wales, but he did not venture to take the aggressive against the English army under Edward. He summoned a meeting of the Welsh chiefs at Denbigh, according to Welsh authorities, but on this point there is some doubt, as he had not probably access to that town. Anyhow, there was a meeting, and Davydd was recognised, and he resolved to continue the war. In the month of March, 1283, Edward moved from Rhuddlan Castle and made the convent of Aberconway his headquarters. The Welsh army was in the strong position of Snowdon, having the castle of Bere as the centre of the place. According to Warrington ("History of Wales") this castle was situated near the lake of Llanberis. The end, however, was near. The troops of Edward were gradually gathering around the district of Snowdon and closing up every pass thereto. The English soldiers in Anglesey had probably crossed the straits of Menai by the bridge of boats which had been reconstructed, and joined in the operations against the Welsh army. The entrance to the mountain stronghold was forced by the troops under the earl of Warwick. During the night these troops fell upon the Welsh soldiers unexpectedly and scattered them. The castle of Bere was besieged and shortly captured by the troops under the earl of Pembroke, and the garrison surrendered. The fighting now soon came to an end. The Welsh troops were disheartened by the death of Llewelyn and their gloomy prospects, and surrendered all their strong places and fled to the rocks and woods of the country for shelter. The English army, consisting partly of foreign soldiers accustomed to hill warfare, were masters of the situation. These events occurred in the months of April and May. The mountainous region being now subdued and the Welsh troops scattered, the English army descended into the plains and swept everything before them, and slaughtered the miserable inhabitants in large numbers; according to some authorities, 3,000 perished in these operations. Prince Davydd, who had concealed himself, his wife, and his nine children in the woods and hills, was captured by the English through the treachery of a Welshman Einion ab Ivor, and another, Gronwy ab Davydd, assisted by his sons. The prince was surprised on the night of the 21st of June, and was made a prisoner with his wife and children. He was conveyed in chains at once to Rhuddlan Castle, where the king then was. Soon afterwards he was sent a prisoner to Shrewsbury. Edward resolved to treat Davydd as a rebellious subject, not as a conquered prince. He summoned a large number of nobles and knights from all parts of England to form a court to try Davydd. They met at Shrews-

bury on the last day in September, 1283. His guilt was to them indisputable and he was condemned to death on the charge of high treason. His body was to be drawn along the streets of Shrewsbury to the place of execution. His head was afterwards cut off and carried to London for exhibition in the Tower near that of his brother Llewelyn. His body was cut up into quarters and sent to different parts of the country, such as York, Winchester, Bristol, and Northampton. Such were the barbarous cruelties of those times. Edward was no doubt a great warrior and a powerful king, but he was extremely cruel and, indeed, ferocious ; and his treatment of Prince Davydd will ever remain on the pages of history as a dark memorial of his cruel and tyrannical nature. A truly great man after a complete victory over a brave and patriotic people led by able princes would have shown some generous and equitable qualities ; but Edward and his leading men did not possess those qualities and did not rise above the barbarous spirit of a cruel and corrupt age. Such was the end of Welsh national independence. The further development will be narrated in succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE LITERATURE OF THE ANCIENT BRITONS, OR THE WELSH, UP TO THE CONQUEST IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The ancient literature of the Welsh people will compare favourably with that of many European nations. Of course it must not be tested by modern standards, but be considered in connection with the times when it was produced. The spirit of modern criticism did not exist in those ancient days when history was produced, and poetry undertook to embody the supposed materials of the origins of mankind and of nations. In those olden times myths were treated as real history. This was the case in the early condition of all nations, including Greece and Rome. We cannot compare Welsh literature with that of ancient Greece and Rome in the period of their classic purity, when Homer, Plato, Virgil, and Cicero flourished. The first efforts of history, even in those distinguished nations, were largely mythical. These myths were no doubt founded on some genuine historical materials, but so modified and coloured that the precise discrimination of modern scientific criticism is necessary to eliminate the one from the other. The more extensive discoveries of recent times by means of explorations of the covered remains of ancient cities and towns have disclosed the remains of ancient civilisation and have revealed to us many important facts which modern critics had ignored or explained away. It is now shown that the civilisation of Egypt and of Babylonia and Assyria was more important and advanced than many critics had imagined. It is now admitted that the nations of Europe, who are mainly of the Aryan family, migrated in successive bands from the cradle of the race in Asia, leaving behind them memorials of their progress. The civilisation of the Greeks and the Romans in its higher form preceded that of Britain, Gaul, and Germany, but it would be a great error to suppose that the latter countries were barbarous when the former were highly civilised. The Babylonians and the Assyrians had libraries of an extensive character before any books were composed in Greece or Rome. There were books in Greece and in Rome before any appeared in Britain, but British civilisation preceded the composition of books.

The literature of the ancient Britons was of two kinds—historical and poetical. The work of Beda—"The Venerable Bede"—be-

longed to the Saxons, and contains the history of the Saxon people and Church, but it contains many narratives relating to the Britons in their relations to the Saxons.

The first book of British history written by a Welshman is that of Gildas. Little is known of him, but it is certain that he was a Briton and wrote his work in the sixth century—probably the year 560—and died in 570. It was written in Latin, and has been translated into English. In a preceding chapter we have described his works. He was in olden times much esteemed, and designated *Sapiens* on account of his knowledge, sanctity, and wisdom.

The second ancient book of British history was written by Nennius. It was written in Latin, under the name of "Historia Britonum," in the ninth century. We have previously described briefly this noted book.

The third book of Welsh origin is that of Geoffrey of Monmouth. It is also called in Latin, "Historia Britonum." To this was added, or rather included, a translation of the "Prophecies of Merlin," the ancient British prophet, who was largely a mythical personage created by successive bards, into the Great Prophet who predicted the destinies of the British people, whose prophecies were brought before them in every crisis of their national history. Another work has been ascribed to Geoffrey, but erroneously—the "Vita Merlini," or "The Life of Merlin." The "History of the Britons," is the most important of the works that bear his name. It was prepared by Geoffrey in the first half of the twelfth century, and was dedicated to Robert, duke of Gloucester, who died in the year 1147, and, therefore, it must have been composed before this event. This earl of Gloucester was the illegitimate son of Henry I., king of England, and was an important person in that age. In his dedication Geoffrey states, of course in flattering language, that the work "sues for the favour of being so corrected by your advice, that it may not be thought to be the poor offspring of Geoffrey of Monmouth, but when polished by your refined wit and judgment, the production of him who had Henry the glorious king of England for his father, and whom we see an accomplished scholar and philosopher, as well as a brave soldier and expert commander; so that Britain with joy acknowledges that in you she possesses another Henry."

The book professes to be a translation from the Welsh language into Latin, with additions and apparently modifications by the translator. The story of the work is as follows: The archdeacon of Oxford, a Welshman, whose name was Walter Mapes *alias* Calenius, who lived during the reign of Henry I., was an antiquarian and a diligent inquirer after old books and libraries. During his residence in Armorica, in France, whose inhabitants were British or Welsh, having largely migrated there from Britain, he made the discovery of an old book written in the British tongue, which appeared to be ancient and very important. He brought it over with him to this country and sought a competent

person to translate the book from Welsh into Latin—the latter being the literary language of the times. Mapes met with Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was well acquainted with the Welsh and Latin languages and also an antiquarian. Geoffrey with delight accepted the task entrusted to him, and in due time the result was the appearance of the history which has ever since been known as "The Historia Britonum of Geoffrey of Monmouth." The translator was a Welshman, a native of Monmouth, and derived his surname from that fact. He became the archdeacon of Monmouth, and afterwards the bishop of St. Asaph, but in consequence of the disturbed state of North Wales he retired from his see to the monastery of Abingdon, and finally to the court of King Henry II. The work remained in its Latin form until the beginning of the eighteenth century, when it was translated into English in the year 1718 by Aaron Thompson of Oxford. A revised translation was made in 1842, and published in the "Six Old English Chronicles," by Henry G. Bohn, the well-known London publisher. The book is the largest historical work of the ancient Britons, and is nearly twice as large as Gildas and Nennius combined.

The value of the book as history is very mixed, and has been subjected to much criticism. On its first appearance it was universally accepted as a great and worthy history of the Britons. The historian, William of Newburgh, who flourished in the latter half of the twelfth century, criticised severely this history. With this exception, it was not opposed until the seventeenth century. It was quoted by many, including even Edward I. in his controversy with Pope Boniface VIII. The character of the book is now differently estimated from what it was in olden times. Its contents are very mixed. It contains many genuine materials of British history which have been used by historians, but these are mixed with many obvious mythical representations. He mentions Gildas and Bede in his preface dedicatory, and complains that in their elegant treatises they have given no account of the kings of Briton before the Incarnation, nor of many others who reigned afterwards, including the renowned Arthur.

The mythical portion of the history is seen in the account which Geoffrey gives of the first king of the Britons and the descent of the British race. In common with Nennius, Geoffrey traces the Britons to the Trojans and the Romans, and makes Brutus—the son of the Roman Sylvius and a niece of Lavinia—the founder and first king of the Britons. This story of the descent of the Britons from Brutus, and through him from the Romans and the Trojans, though now universally regarded as an obvious myth, was formerly believed in as genuine history. The distinguished Giraldus Cambrensis of the twelfth century, Leland, Sir John Price, Humphrey Llwyd, Dr. Caius, and Dr. Powel, and many others of former times accepted the myth as history. In ascribing the origin of the Britons to Brutus the ancient British writer imitated the conduct of the oldest Roman

historians, who ascribed the foundation of Rome to Romulus and Remus. The science of historical criticism in modern times has largely eliminated the mythical elements from ancient history, and within certain limits has enabled us to understand the real history of peoples and nations, including the Britons. It would serve no good purpose to give here from Geoffrey a genealogical table of the imaginary princes who reigned over Briton from Brutus to the time when the Romans invaded the country, and when some real light began to be cast on the country and the people as previously described. Nevertheless, the history of the Britons by Geoffrey does contain many genuine materials of real history, though mixed up with mythical elements.

There are some ancient books in the form of annals or chronicles which were not purely British or Welsh, but yet are so closely connected with Welsh history as to deserve mention here. The first we will name is Asser's "Life of Alfred the Great." The author, Asser, was a Welshman, and was bishop of St. David's in the time of Alfred the Great. He was also said to have been bishop of Sherborne and of Exeter. He gives the Life of Alfred in the form of annals, but the contents are also the same as substantially are found in the Saxon Chronicle. He gives the Life of Alfred from his birth in the year 849 to his death in October, 900, or more correctly, in the year 901, as recorded in the Saxon Chronicle.

"The Chronicle of Fabius Ethelward" professes to give in four books the history of this country from the beginning of the world to the year of our Lord 975. His narrative is placed in the form of chronicles under definite dates, and was dedicated to Matilda, the daughter of Otto, the emperor of Germany, to whom he was related. He belonged to the royal family of England. The book was written in Latin and translated into English by S. Giles for Bohn's "Six Old Chronicles" in 1848. The writer lived in the tenth century. He was a Saxon and not a Welshman, and wrote for the benefit of Matilda. There is not much in it that is not found in the Saxon Chronicle, and there is very little of purely British or Welsh history. It refers to the departure of the Romans from Britain and the invitation of the Britons, under the advice of their king, Vortigern, to the Saxons to come and defend them against the Scots and Picts. The writer remarks that the "degraded race was debased by ignorance, and they saw not that they were preparing for themselves perpetual slavery, which is the stepmother of all misfortune." The remainder of the book is a chronicle of events in the history of the Anglo-Saxons beginning from the year 449 and ending in 973 or 975.

The historian, Richard of Cirencester, whose surname was derived from the place of his birth, the ancient town in Gloucestershire, flourished in the fourteenth century. In 1350 he became a monk in the Benedictine monastery of St. Peter in Westminster. Like many monks, he devoted much of his time to the study of history and antiquities, and travelled to Rome and visited

different libraries in England and elsewhere. He wrote several works, theological and historical. The most important is the history of this country in two books. The first contains a description of the ancient condition of Britain. He states that the length of Britain was over 800 miles. In this he followed the description given by Gildas and Nennius and Geoffrey of Monmouth, all of whom represent Britain as 800 miles long and 200 miles broad. Richard quoted the geographer Agrippa in support of the statement that the breadth of Britain is 300 miles, but prefers the estimate of the Venerable Bede as 200 miles exclusive of the promontories. These writers have evidently derived the figures the one from the other, and all were in error. A considerable portion of his history was derived from Roman and British sources. He did not, however, follow the native opinion that the Britons were derived through Brutus from the Romans and the Trojans. He states (book I. chap. iii.) that the original inhabitants of Britain are unknown, like those of most other countries except the Jews. Richard died in the abbey infirmary in the year 1401 or 1402.

In the twelfth century there flourished in South Wales a Welshman, famous in literature and in other respects, whose name was Gerald the Welshman. He was known mostly under the Latin form of his name, Giraldus Cambrensis. He was born at Manorbier Castle, in the county of Pembroke, which, according to his own account, was the sweetest spot in Wales. He was sometimes by way of reproach called by Englishmen Sylvester Giraldus. He was descended from a noble family. His father was William de Barry, of a noble Norman family, and his mother was Angharad, descended from the famous Nesta, the daughter of Rhys ab Tewdwr, the last of the Welsh kings in South Wales. This Nesta was a woman of rare personal beauty, which led to many intrigues among great men. Gerald, who was her grandson, was considered very handsome, and partook of the qualities of Nesta. The time of his birth was probably the year 1147. He lived over seventy years, and died in the early years of Henry III., or the year 1220, at St. David's, where he was interred. He was the author of many works written in Latin, which then and long after was the literary language of Europe. Strange as it may seem, Gerald, though a Welshman and a strenuous defender of the rights of the Welsh Church and of Wales, knew Welsh very imperfectly, and was not able to preach in that language. Gerald was educated under the care of his uncle, the bishop of St. David's, whose name was David Fitz-Gerald. The state of learning in Wales was then very low, and no place of learning has been mentioned in history as existing in the country. His education was continued at the abbey of St. Peter's, in the city of Gloucester. From Gloucester he was sent to Paris, where he went through the usual course of three years' study. Dr. Freeman, the historian, designated him "the universal scholar." He was in fact one of the most learned men

of his age. In his numerous books he quoted from the Sacred Scriptures, from the Church fathers, from Latin literature generally, some Greek words, and Welsh, though his acquaintance with it was limited. He probably knew Welsh well enough to read and understand it, but not to preach in it. Soon after his return from Paris to Wales, Gerald was ordained, and held in a short time the livings of Llanwnda, Tenby, and Angle, and also Chesterton St. Mary, in Oxfordshire. He also became canon of St. David's, and in addition prebendary of Hereford. There were in those days pluralists in the Church and in the State. It was said, however, that these offices were not sinecures to him, but that he saw that the duties were faithfully performed. The uncle of Gerald, the bishop of St. David's, was indolent, and allowed his diocese to get into disorder. The farmers of Dyved and Cardigan had refused under these circumstances to pay their tithes. Gerald undertook the task of restoring the affairs of the diocese to order, and amongst other things he obtained authority from the pope's legate, Richard, the archbishop of Canterbury, to compel the recusants to pay by employing the weapon of excommunication—in this case the lesser excommunication, which involved exclusion from the sacraments and services of the Church. The Welshmen soon submitted, but the Flemings of Dyved continued obstinate until the Welshmen took from them their sheep and wool.

"The reforming canon directed his attention to the clergy of the diocese and laboured to bring them into harmony with the Roman Church. In the previous century Pope Hildebrand had made many changes in the Church, and amongst them was the enforcement of the celibacy of the clergy. In Wales, however, this new regulation was not much observed, and many of the Welsh clergy were married men. Some time before this activity of Gerald, the son of a bishop of St. David succeeded his father. Gerald, however, was a jealous churchman and strove to enforce the celibacy of the clergy in the diocese of St. David. The archdeacon of Brecon at this time, whose name was Jordan, was a married man and now was advanced in life. He refused to obey the order and kept his wife, but lost his office of archdeacon, and the office was taken by Gerald in the year 1175."

There was a dispute in those times concerning the precise boundaries of the dioceses of St. David and St. Asaph. The question came to an issue in the consecration of the church of St. Michael in the parish of Kerry in the county of Montgomery. Gerald learnt that the bishop of St. Asaph was on his way to dedicate the new church attended by many men of the state of Powys. The zealous canon hastened to the scene to defend the rights of St. David's see, and arrived there before the St. Asaph bishop and party. Without giving a minute description of the contest, it may be stated that they came nearly to blows, but the victory was Gerald's, and Kerry was recognised as belonging to the diocese of St. David. There must, however, have been

afterwards some compromise, for now the church is within the diocese of St. Asaph, but the living is in the gift of the bishop of St. David.

The active and zealous churchman, Gerald, was ambitious, and aimed at the bishopric of St. David as the successor of his uncle David, who died in the year 1176. The chapter, according to custom, nominated for the office the four archdeacons, intending that Gerald should be elected by the sanction of the king, Henry II. The king, however, did not like such an energetic champion of Wales and the Welsh Church as Gerald and refused his consent. Another person was elected—Peter de Leia, the Cluniac prior of Wenlock—by the canons summoned to Winchester, and constrained to obey the order of the king. Being thus disappointed, he retired to Paris and spent three years there in his literary studies. After his return he was made administrator of the diocese of St. David's, the bishop being absent and being a weak and incompetent man. Afterwards, however, Gerald was reconciled to the bishop and to the king, who gave him several offices, including that of royal chaplain in the year 1184, and employed him as a tool in promoting peace in the Welsh Marches.

We are concerned here, however, with Gerald mainly as a man of letters. The story of his contest for the office of bishop of St. David's after the death of Peter de Leia, which lasted for five years —1198–1203—may be passed over here. He was a voluminous writer. The Rolls Edition of his works consists of "seven ponderous volumes of Mediæval Latin." Mr. Henry Owen, B.C.L., has written a volume founded upon his lecture on Giraldus Cambrensis in the year 1889, which gives a most interesting summary of the life and writings of this distinguished man, to which we are mainly indebted for the materials contained in this account. Besides some shorter writings of great interest, the following were written by him referred to by Mr. Owen.

The earliest of Gerald's works was the "Topographia Hibernica," in which he describes the scenery and social condition of Ireland, considered then a wild and semi-barbarous country. It was dedicated to King Henry II. and consisted of three books. The physical features of the island, its natural history, and the inhabitants are treated of. He gives a description of the Irish people which is not very flattering. They were too indolent to work the metals beneath their feet or to engage in manufactures, trade, or even agriculture. He describes their clothing as black woollen rugs, instead of cloaks, of the colour of their sheep, and breeches and hose of one piece and dyed bright. They had no saddles on their horses, and they led them by a crooked stick. They carried a battle-axe, of which the modern shillalagh without the head is the representative. They loved music ; they were superstitious ; they wailed at their funerals ; their clergy were chaste, devoted to their duties ; they fasted, but after a day of prayer and fasting they would spend the whole night in drinking. Gerald, however, was not charitable, but a severe critic of men and their deeds.

He wrote another book on Ireland, namely, the "Expugnatio Hibernica," or "The Conquest of Ireland." His remarks on Ireland were very unfavourable and excited much indignant remonstrance.

One of the most important of Gerald's works was the Itinerary through Wales—"Itinerarium Kambriæ." Henry II., in the year 1187, assumed the cross and made preparations for the third crusade to drive the "infidels" from the holy city of Jerusalem, which they then occupied. Henry himself did not take any part in leading the English crusaders to Palestine, but his son Richard did. He, however, sent Baldwin, the archbishop of Canterbury, and Ranulf de Glanville, the justiciary, into Wales to preach the crusade. In the course of their journey through Wales they persuaded 3,000 Welshmen to join the crusaders. Baldwin and Ranulf subsequently went to Palestine, and both died there in the year 1191.

Gerald, who was then full of energy and comparatively young, was appointed to join the company, and indeed became their leader in the journey through Wales ; and this book was written to describe the journey. The tour commenced on Ash Wednesday, 1187, and started from Hereford. They visited Radnor, Hay, and Llanddew, where Gerald then lived as canon of Brecon, then across the hills to Abergavenny, down the valley of the Usk to Caerleon and Newport, and then to the castle of Cardiff. Then they passed through Llandaff to the monastery of Margam in Glamorganshire ; then to Neath and Swansea, and to Kidweli, and over the Towy to Caermarthen ; thence by Whitland to Haverfordwest, and then to St. David's. Then by the northern coast they visited Cardigan, or Aberteivy, where they were liberally entertained by Rhys ab Gruffydd, the lord Rhys of South Wales, the last prince of Deheubarth. From Cardigan they proceeded up the Teivy to the ancient abbey of Strata Florida, designated by some the Westminster Abbey of Wales. Then they proceeded to Llanbadarn Vawr, once a cathedral church, until in the eighth century the see was merged in that of St. David's after an independent existence of two centuries. Then they came to North Wales by crossing the Dovey. Following the coast, they arrived at Pwllheli, passing Harlech without mentioning it. Then they advanced to Nevin ; afterwards Anglesey, Bangor, and St. Asaph, and to Holywell and Chester. Then, turning inland, they moved on quickly through Powys, passing through Oswestry, Shrewsbury, and Ludlow, and arriving at Hereford, the starting-point. They spent a month in the tour through South Wales, but only eight days in passing through North Wales.

Gerald has given an elaborate account of this peculiar tour, and its chief value consists in his independent observations on the places and peoples visited as indicating the condition of the country in the twelfth century. In his visit to Llanthony, which he made alone, he describes the beauty of the district and refers to the little church of St. David, which was the original of the famous abbey of the Order of St. Augustine, known as the abbey

of Llanthony. He took the opportunity, which he often did, to denounce all the monastic orders. The visit to Pembroke led him to praise his native Manorbier. The superstition of the times is indicated by his remark that the houses were haunted by evil spirits who divulged the secrets of the inmates and slandered even the priests armed with the crucifix and holy water. In the visit to St. David's he described the ancient glories of the seat of the primate of Wales, as the bishop of St. David's was then regarded. The visit to North Wales was the occasion for magnifying the mountains of Snowdon and the miracles associated therewith. At Cardiff we have the story of the warning once given to Henry II. on Sunday observances in English, a language which the king could understand but could not speak. The Norman kings spoke generally in French. At Llandaff the English stood in church on one side and the Welsh on the other. At Haverfordwest Gerald preached in Latin and French, and the people are represented as moved to tears by his eloquence, though they did not understand anything he said. He describes the Flemings who settled in that district in the reigns of Henry I. and Henry II., and calls them a brave and robust people ever hostile to the Welsh. In the Welsh Chronicles they are called cowards, but this was evidently a slander. At Llanbadarn Vawr there was a lay abbot, and this led Gerald to denounce the habit among the Welsh clergy of making laymen the patrons of their churches, who ultimately possessed them as their private property. Merioneth is described as the roughest district of Wales, but North Wales excelled in the use of the lance and South Wales in that of the bow. The island of Bardsey, in Caernarvonshire, is called the Isle of the Saints, where through the merits of the blessed saints disease was unknown and no one died except from old age. The isle of Anglesey, or Mona, is described as very fertile, giving rise to the Welsh proverb, "Mon, mam Kembre" —Mona, the mother of Wales. These are specimens of Gerald's observations.

The next book of importance written by Gerald was called in Latin "Descriptio Kambriæ"—the Description of Wales. It was first published about the year 1194, dedicated to Archbishop Hubert. There was a second edition published about the year 1215, dedicated to Stephen Langton, the successor of Hubert as archbishop of Canterbury. There were other editions published, but these two alone have survived. The MSS. of other editions are in the British Museum and at Cambridge. In the beginning of the work he describes the three remaining tribes or groups of Britons in Wales, Cornwall, and Brittany, and the three divisions of Wales itself—namely, North Wales, designated Venedotia or Gwynedd ; South Wales, or Dimetia or Deheubarth ; and the middle or eastern division called Powys. He records the genealogy of the Welsh princes of North and South Wales to Rhoderic the Great. He describes the four cathedrals, the noble rivers which flow from Snowdon and Plynlimmon. North Wales,

he declares, has the strongest men and the most fertile soil. The purest Welsh was spoken in North Wales, or perhaps in Brittany, though some held that the speech of Cardigan was the most genuine. Gerald accepted the mythical history of the Britons, deriving Cambria from Camber, the son of Brutus the Trojan. Gerald, who was descended from the Britons and the Normans, indulges in praise of his countrymen, though in other places he describes them in dark colours. They were a nation of warriors ; they were a pastoral people, but cared nothing for commerce ; they were frugal, but hospitable ; every man keeps open house ; there was no beggar in the land. They had no table linen ; they sat on rushes or fresh grass ; three guests ate out of the same wooden plate instead of two, the custom elsewhere, though in later times there were four guests to a plate, who were called a mess. Their food was a thin, broad cake of bread baked every day, sweet herbs, and sometimes chopped meat with broth. The host and hostess waited on the company. They were skilled in music ; the musical instruments were the harp, the pipe, said to have been introduced into Wales from Ireland in the year 1080 by Gruffydd ab Cynan, and the crwth, a fiddle of six strings. Companies of singers went about who sang in parts and not in unison. Their rhetorical powers and their rhymed songs were considerable. Gerald states that the Welshman loved high descent and carried his pedigree about with him. He praised the purity and antiquity of their faith. They broke the first piece of every loaf for the poor and asked a blessing of every priest or monk they met. They paid their tithes—two-thirds to their baptismal church and one-third to the bishop. The churches had the right of sanctuary, which was often abused. Gerald states nowhere will you find worse men than the bad or better than the good. The contemporary of Gerald was Walter Mapes, the archdeacon of Oxford, who was also a distinguished Welshman. His account of the Welsh was not as favourable as Gerald's. Gerald as an historian enumerates the conquests over the Welsh by Ethelfrith (in 613), Offa (in 794), and Harold (in 1063).

It would be tedious to prolong our description of Gerald's works and their contents. In number they exceeded twenty, including those already described and those not mentioned, namely, "The Jewel of the Church," "The Book of Invectives," "The Rights of St. David's," "The Instruction of Princes," "The Lives of the Saints," &c.

Gerald had his faults. He was violent and ambitious, and some said vain. He was, however, a great scholar and a great writer, and thoroughly honest. He rebuked sin among the great and the low. He loved his country, Wales, but he was favourable to its subordination to England. He contended for the independence of the Welsh Church. Freeman, in his "Norman Conquest," calls him the father of comparative philology. "In his pure and noble life, his hatred of tyranny in every form, his love of nature, his wit and humour, his earnest striving after reform, . . . his

wonderful learning, the figure of the great archdeacon stands out across seven centuries, towering above his fellows as he did in actual life" (H. Owen).

In the twelfth century one of the sons of Owain Gwynedd, of North Wales, was Madoc. In after times this prince was celebrated by the Welsh bards as the discoverer of America, anticipating the discovery made by Columbus. The statement is made in one of the Triads in these words, as quoted by Woodward: "Madoc ab Owain Gwynedd, who with 300 men went to sea in ten ships, and it is not known whither they went." Another statement was: "Myrddin Emrys in a ship of glass went away, and neither returned." Many pieces of poetry have been quoted in this discussion to the same effect, on whose figurative and ambiguous language patriotic Welshmen have constructed the theory that the first discoverer of America was a Welshman. The theory was expressed by the historian Humphrey Llwyd, or Lloyd, in his "History of Cambria," in these words: "Madoc ab Owain Gwynedd left the land in contention betwixed his brothers, and prepared certain ships with men and munitions and sought adventures by seas, sailing west, and leaving the coast of Ireland so far north that he came to a land unknown, where he saw many strange things. . . . This land to which Madoc came must needs be some part of Nova Hispania or Florida. Whereupon it is manifest that that country was long before by Britons discovered, afore Columbus or Americus Vespertius led any Spaniards thither."[1]

The late Mr. Thomas Stephens, author of the important work "The Literature of the Kymry," a most able and learned and impartial writer, composed a book in response to the invitation of the Welsh Eisteddfod for 1858, on the subject "For the best essay upon the discovery of America in the twelfth century by Prince Madoc ab Owain Gwynedd." The essays sent in were six, of which five took the affirmative side and one the negative. The essay on the negative side was written by Mr. Stephens, and was rejected because it "was not on the subject." The fact is the Welshmen in authority were so full of national feeling that they made historical criticism subordinate to what was regarded as Welsh patriotism. The work was not published during the lifetime of the author, but in the year 1893 it was published and edited by Llywarch Reynolds, B.A. (Oxon). This work goes fully into the question, and examines all the authorities on the subject, historical and poetic; and the author comes to the certain conclusion that the story has no foundation in fact. He examined the "Bardic Poems," the "Historical Testimonies," and "Travellers' Tales," and his conclusion is expressed on page 216 in these words: "I have to state, after a careful and, it is believed, fair consideration of all the evidence, that Madoc the son of Owen Gwynedd never left Wales, but came to a violent death in his own country, in the lifetime of his father, and from two to six years

[1] See page 228 of Lloyd's book, which professes to be an enlargement and correction of the work composed by Sir John Price in the sixteenth century.

before the assigned date of his alleged voyage. The narrative must, therefore, cease to be accounted historical."

The detailed course of his argument cannot be here even summarised, but the conclusion may be safely accepted. The claim on behalf of a Welshman, Madoc, to have discovered America in the twelfth century was not made until after the real discovery had been made by Columbus in the fifteenth century. This claim was founded on the ambiguous language of the ancient bards, and a meaning was placed on that language which was really derived from the knowledge gained by the discoveries of Columbus. By the adoption of this method of interpretation almost anything may be proved to the satisfaction of speculative minds anxious to gratify patriotic aspirations. The conclusion must, however, be abandoned as unhistoric.

The ancient literature of the Welsh people was considerable, though, like that of every other people, mixed with myth. The historical work called "Brut y Tywysogion," or, in English, "The Chronicles of the Welsh Princes," is of great historical value. It extends from A.D. 681 to 1282. It was written chiefly by Caradoc of Llancarvan, who flourished in the twelfth century and died in the year 1156. He was not the same person as St. Caradoc, who died thirty-two years before the chronicler. The work was continued and revised by a later writer, bringing the history up to the year 1282. The work was probably written originally in Welsh, and afterwards rendered into Latin, the literary language of the Middle Ages.

Another British source of history is the work "Annales Cambriæ"—"The Annals of Wales." They record events among the Welsh people from the year A.D. 444 to 1288. They were written originally probably in Welsh, but they have come down to us in Latin. The composition of these annals have been ascribed not to one person but to the monks of the once celebrated monastery of Strata Florida, in Cardiganshire. The records of these ancient documents have supplied materials for modern historians, and are woven into the texture of their narratives.

The "Saxon Chronicles," though mainly concerned with the Anglo-Saxon history, necessarily contains materials that involve British or Welsh history. They embrace the time from Cæsar's invasion to the reign of Henry II. in the twelfth century. In the last fifty or sixty years of the nineteenth century much has been done by governmental action to preserve and to make known the most ancient documents which have been the sources of information relating to the history of the different races, including the Britons, which have successively occupied this country. As early as the year 1822 an address was presented by the House of Commons to King George IV., in response to which the king ordered the Commissioners on Public Records to take steps for the publication of the ancient histories of the realm. About ten years afterwards there were published in two volumes the important work in an English translation, "The Ancient Laws of

Howel Dda, or Howel the Good." Then followed in 1848 the ponderous volume designated "Monumenta Historica Britannica," containing some seventeen works, including those mentioned in this chapter and some others. The whole of the works are, however, not completed in this great volume, but in subsequent works published by the Record Commissioners. "The Record Office (proper) was opened in 1858. The public records, which had been kept in the Tower and elsewhere in a state of the greatest confusion, were brought there; also the State papers, which had previously been moved from the Tower, and since 1833 had been lodged in the State Paper Office in St. James's Park" (H. Owen).

"The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" included in the above was written by many persons, and brings up the record from the time of Julius Cæsar to the year 1154. The introductory part relating to Britain itself was copied from the Venerable Bede's description. The work states that the original inhabitants of this country were the Britons, and that they came from Armorica, in Gaul. The noted old writer, the Venerable Bede, the monk of Monkwearmouth, related in his history the events of this country from the time of Cæsar to the year 731. His history is highly esteemed by English writers, but he was not just to the Britons who refused to submit to the Romish missionary Augustine.

There is another ancient book of British origin which ought to be mentioned here. It is the "Mabinogion," or "Juvenile Tales." It was translated some years ago (1849) into English by the late Lady Guest, who was a good Welsh scholar. These tales were written for the amusement of young chieftains, to enable them to while away the time, to be repeated at the fireside, and to cultivate the feeling of chivalry. In the translation made by Lady Charlotte Guest in the first half of the nineteenth century, the title page is thus given: "The Mabinogion, from the 'Llyfr Coch o Hergest' and other Ancient Welsh Manuscripts, with an English Translation and Notes by Lady Charlotte Guest." These tales for the young are very ancient, but of different ages. According to Woodward, the *form* in which they have been handed down to us is not later than the fourteenth or fifteenth century. They existed, however, many ages before this date. They existed first only in oral form, and were thus handed down from one generation to another and subjected to modifications. They were very popular among the Welsh people, and were often recited at public entertainments and private meetings. They constituted the romances or the fictitious literature of the Welsh people during the Middle Ages. "In the 'Mabinogion' . . . we possess—what some have doubted—the existence of genuine Welsh fictions. In all these stories, we may further remark, the topography is tolerably clear and correct within the boundaries of the principality; but beyond those limits it is shadowy and indistinct as that of dreamland; from which we conclude that Wales is their birthplace" (Woodward).

The late Mr. Thomas Stephens, the author of the able work,

"The Literature of the Kymry," was a good Welsh scholar, and a broad and accurate historical critic. In this book, of course, he discusses the character and the age of the "Mabinogion." He remarks (p. 396): "It is utterly inconsistent with our knowledge of human history to suppose that the national mind of Wales could have been for any lengthened period inactive; we may, therefore, conclude that the long and barren period which intervenes between the death of Cadwaladr and the arrival of Gruffydd ab Kynan —from the seventh to the eleventh century—could not have been wholly unproductive. The bards were engaged in recording the actions of their countrymen, which, becoming more and more known, became more and more glorious. Plain facts were embellished into glorious facts; brave warriors became great heroes; and Arthur, an insignificant chieftain in the sixth century, grew into a valorous warrior in the eighth, and by the twelfth had become emperor of the whole civilised world." "A very large portion of the romantic incidents in Geoffrey were most probably found in the home traditions; and the Dream of Rhonabwy, the Mabinogi of Kilhwch and Olwen, and the tale of Gwgan the poet, show that the Kymry were in the the habit of writing tales, and that they knew well how to do so; for the second of these is very ingeniously constructed. We may therefore safely conclude that the Mabinogion could have been produced here; and there is sufficient evidence to show that the Kymry did so produce them." Lady Guest considered that the Mabinogion differed so much in character that they may be placed in two classes—one of which generally celebrates heroes of the Arthurian cyclus. The other class were the earliest in time and make no mention of Arthur at all, and treat of persons who lived much earlier; these are the Mabinogion of Pwyll, prince of Dyved; Branwen, the daughter of Llyr; Manawyddan, the son of Llyr; Math, the son of Mathonwy; the Dream of Maxen Wledig; the Tale of Lludd and Llwetis; and the Mabinogi of Taliesin."

Stephens says that it is not easy to fix the date of these tales. He thought that in their present form they are not older than the twelfth century; but they were in circulation, perhaps, centuries earlier. There had been for hundreds of years traditions floating among the Welsh people, and when the general awakening took place, it was natural that these should be connected, arranged, and written. "This was the origin of the Mabinogion tales written to while away the time of the young chieftains." In the "Archæologia Britannica," by Llwyd, the Mabinogion are divided into three classes, though the term is applied to all the tales. These classes are: Juvenile Tales, the Mabinogion proper; secondly, Dreams—Brenddyoydion; and thirdly, Stories—Ystoriau. According to T. Stephens, the ancient bards did not admit the credibility of the Arthurian Tales, and that the first traces of the Arthur of romance must be sought among the Kymry of Armorica, who came from Britain as refugees and carried with them the histories of their ancestors.

Stephens remarks that the authors of the Mabinogion are unknown; most probably the tales were orally transmitted for centuries before they were reduced to writing; and as they increased by being repeated, it would be difficult to discover their paternity. He goes on to say that no date can be assigned to the story of Kilhwch and Olwen; it was well known in 1169. The Dream of Rhonabwy is posterior to the time of Madoc ab Meredydd, prince of Powys, who died in the year 1159. Mr. Stephens remarks that "the Mabinogion combine dignity of expression with a fine flow of language, and are remarkable for their quaintness and simplicity"; and they have been wonderfully translated into English by Lady Charlotte Guest. We could not here afford space to give even an outline of these ancient and remarkable tales, but a sample must suffice from the one called Peredur the son of Evrawc, or Peredur ab Evrawc.

In the notes of Lady Charlotte Guest it is stated that "of the real history of Peredur nothing is known. It is probable that he fell in the battle of Cattraeth, in the beginning of the sixth century, as Aneurin mentions a chieftain of this name among the slain." She also remarks that "Peredur is frequently alluded to by the bards of the Middle Ages in terms of the high esteem in which his deeds of prowess then were held. Gruffydd ab Meredydd, who flourished about the end of the thirteenth century, in his elegy on Tudor ap Grono, one of the ancestors of the House of Tudor, mentions him in the following words: 'O Bountiful Creator of the radiant sun and waning moon, sad is the fall of the chief of valiant deeds. Eagle of the battle charge, *equal to Peredur*, Tudor assaulter of the Angles, he who never shunned the fight.' The story begins thus: 'Earl Evrawc owned the earldom of the North. And he had seven sons. And Evrawc maintained himself not so much by his own possessions as by attending tournaments, and wars, and combats. And as it often befalls those who join in encounters and wars, he was slain, and six of his sons likewise. Now the name of his seventh son was Peredur, and he was the youngest of them. And he was not of an age to go to wars and encounters, otherwise he might have been slain as well as his father and brothers. His mother was a scheming and thoughtful woman, and she was very solicitous concerning this her only son and his possessions. So she took counsel with herself to leave the inhabited country, and fled to the deserts and unfrequented wildernesses.' Then the tale proceeds to describe the conduct of the mother and the condition of life in the wilderness and the conduct of Peredur. '"Ah! mother," said he, "a marvellous thing have I seen in the wood; two of thy goats have run wild and lost their horns, through their having been so long missing in the wood. And no man had ever more trouble than I had to drive them in." . . . And one day they saw three knights coming along the horseroad on the borders of the forest. And the three knights were Gwalchmai, the son of Gwyar, and Genier Gwystyl, and Owain, the son of Urien. And Owain kept on the track

of the knight who had divided the apples in Arthur's whom they were in pursuit of. "Mother," said Peredur, "what are those yonder?" "They are angels, my son," said she. "By my faith," said Peredur, "I will go and become an angel with them." And Peredur went to the road and met them. "Tell me, good soul," said Owain, "sawest thou a knight pass this way, either to-day or yesterday?" "I know not," answered he, "what a knight is." "Such an one as I am," said Owain. "If thou wilt tell me what I ask thee, I will tell thee that which thou askest me." "Gladly will I do so," replied Owain. Then Peredur asked what the various things belonging to the horses were, and Owain showed him these things. . . . Then Peredur returned to his mother and her company, and he said to her, "Mother, those were not angels, but honourable knights." Then his mother swooned away. And Peredur went to the place where they kept the horses that carried firewood, &c. . . . And when Peredur came again to his mother, the countess had recovered from her swoon. "My son," said she, "desirest thou to ride forth." "Yes, with thy leave," said he. "Wait, then, that I may counsel thee before thou goest." "Willingly," he answered; "speak quickly." "Go forward," then she said, "to the court of Arthur, where there are the best and the boldest and the most beautiful of men. And wherever thou seest a church, repeat there thy Paternoster unto it." The preceding was introductory to the story. Peredur then mounted the horse and rode forth to the court of Arthur. The different stages of the journey are described and the incidents narrated. The court of Arthur is here described as at Caerleon (p. 338) upon Usk, where Peredur went with him to hunt. This location was given in the mythological account on the groundless assumption that Arthur was the hero and king of the Silures. The earlier bards attach no importance to Caerleon but the latter do" (T. S.). To enter fully into the discussion of all the Mabinogion would require a volume.

The Mabinogi of Branwen, the daughter of Llyr, professes to give an account of the lady who was accounted the fairest damsel in the world. Bran the Blessed was the son of Llyr, and was the crowned king of this island, and was exalted from the crown of London. One day he was at Harlech, in Ardudwy, at his court, and he sat upon the rock of Harlech and looked over the sea. His brothers and many nobles were with him. He saw thirteen ships approaching, which were the ships of Matholwch, king of Ireland. To the messengers sent from Bran the king of Ireland stated that he came to seek an alliance with the Island of the Mighty. He was allowed to land, and presented the suit that he might have as his wife Branwen. This was, after due ceremony, granted, and it was arranged that the marriage ceremony should take place at Aberffraw. Thither the king of Ireland and his attendants proceeded by sea, and Bran and his nobles by land. The marriage took place and the British maiden accompanied her royal husband to Ireland. The tale goes on to narrate the incidents

of her life and the ill-treatment she received in Ireland. Of course the tale is a fiction and cannot be reconciled with historical facts. There never was a king of Ireland. There were many chieftains and princes, sometimes called kings of certain provinces, but no king of Ireland. In the mythology of British or Welsh history, Bran appears as the father of Caradoc, or Caractacus, the great British general who was carried prisoner to Rome. His captivity was shared by Bran, who there became converted to Christianity, and afterwards became the introducer of the Christian religion into Britain. On this account he has been called Bran the Blessed son of Llyr.

These must suffice as samples of the ancient Juvenile Tales designated the Mabinogion.

The Welsh documents that go under the name of The Triads have been considered by students of history as most interesting and also useful in the illustration of Welsh history, manners, and language. They express the ancient practice of arranging facts or subjects in *Threes*. According to T. Stephens, the practice existed among other peoples, including the Jews and Romans. He refers to two passages in the Old Testament where the Triads are given—namely, 2 Sam. xxiiii. 8–23 and 1 Chron. xi. 10–35—and one or two in Tacitus. The principle is not, however, so evident as in the Welsh documents. The practice prevailed among the Druids, according to Stephens, though there is no historical Triad now existing that can be referred to so ancient a period. There are a "few historical Triads in the poems of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, but no *collection* of them known to us can claim a higher antiquity than the latter date." Our collections are three in number. The first and the oldest is that collection contained in the MS.—the Red Book of Hergest, now at Jesus College, Oxford, or Llyfr Coch o Hergest. The last person named in this series is Owain Gwynedd, who died in 1169. There is in this book also a record brought down to the year 1318. The latest date in the book is the year 1454. The book cannot, therefore, be older than the middle of the fifteenth century.

The second series, though placed first in the "Myvyrian Archæology," is contained in the book of Mr. Vaughan of Hengwrt, or "Trioedd Ynys Prydain allan o Llyvyr Mr. R. Vaughan o R. Hengwrt." Mr. Stephens states that the date could not be earlier than the fifteenth century.

The third series refers to the Graal, and must be referred to the sixteenth century.

Although the extant books containing the Triads are not older than the fourteenth or fifteenth century, the practice of presenting facts and topics in threes existed at a much earlier period. Some Triads may be as old as the time of the Druids. The Triadic form is seen in the poems of Aneurin and Llywarch Hen, and Mr. Vaughan, of Hengwrt, was of opinion that some of them were collected in the seventh century.

The Triads have been divided according to their subject matter as Triads of history, bardism, theology, ethics, and jurisprudence. Originally the practice was established to aid the memory. The bards recited these Triads at their congresses and meetings before the time when they were reduced to writing, and the threefold manner of construction aided the memory.

The ancient books of Wales have come down to us in remarkable manuscripts referred to on the pages of this work. They have been classified as follows: 1. Glossaries and Grammars; 2. The Bruts, or Annals and Histories; 3. Poems; 4. Mabinogion, or Prose Tales; 5. Laws; and 6. Medicines. The oldest and the most important of these manuscripts are found in four collections which Mr. W. F. Skene, the learned historian, has designated the Four Ancient Books of Wales. They are as follows:—

1. The Black Book of Caermarthen. It originally belonged to the Black Friars of Caermarthen Priory, hence the name. It consists of fifty-four leaves written on vellum in Gothic letters. It belonged to the late Sir John Price, and came into the possession of the Vaughans of Hengwrt, and is now in the possession of W. W. E. Wynn, of Peniarth. This copy was written in the twelfth century, in the reign of Henry II., A.D. 1154–1189.

2. The Book of Aneurin. It is a MS. belonging to the Hengwrt collection, and was written in the latter part of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century. It consists of nineteen folios, and contains the Gododin and four Gorchanau, or Songs. It became the property of Sir Thomas Phillips, of Middle Hall.

3. The Book of Taliesin. This MS. contains fifty-six poems written on thirty-eight leaves in vellum, and belongs to the beginning of the fourteenth century. It also belongs to the noted Hengwrt collection, and was bequeathed by Sir R. Vaughan to W. W. E. Wynn, of Peniarth.

4. The Red Book of Hergest. The name is derived from the Hergest Court, one of the seats of the Vaughans, near Knighton, Radnorshire. It is a MS. of different periods from the early part of the fourteenth to the middle of the fifteenth century. It is preserved in the library of Jesus College, Oxford. It is a thick volume of 360 leaves of vellum written in double columns, apparently in three different handwritings. It includes the Mabinogion, translated by Lady Guest.

The bards of Wales were a class of learned and literary men held in great honour by the rulers and people of Wales for many ages. They were the teachers of the young princes, and they were important officers in the palaces of kings and princes. Sometimes even princes and warriors cultivated the bardic art. The bard was, according to the Laws of Howel Dda, to be one of the officers of the royal court, where he was to sit next to the chief of the household and have the harp placed in his hand by that officer; he was to play on the harp and sing for the pleasure of the court or the assembly; and on going forth to battle he was to sing the national anthem. The domestic bard had the charge of the

historical documents of the tribe and its chief, and was his laureate. The poems which the bards composed were in many instances recited or sung at the feasts of the princes, and were panegyrics on the chiefs. Some were love songs, and others were elegies on the distinguished dead composed at the request of the surviving relatives. The bards were accustomed to make a tour of the country every three years. According to the regulations framed by themselves, the chief bards in these tours were allowed to enter the houses of the chiefs and nobles, and were prohibited the houses of a lower grade. The lower class of bards were limited to the houses of the common people. The bard was a welcome visitor wherever he went, and had free access to the palaces or the houses of the people according to his grade. The bards of North Wales visited South Wales, and those of the South came to North Wales. They were the teachers of the young and the advisers of the great. Their influence was considerable, and was sometimes exercised for good and sometimes for evil. Their songs of praise were often extremely flattering to their patrons and often wanting in sincerity. Their position was not favourable to the cultivation of a truthful and independent spirit.

The manners and morals of the petty and low grade of the bards were not good. These were called in ancient times "small beer poets"—"Beirdd Yspyddaid." There were different classes of bards—three at least. The chief and most important were called Prydyddion, and they occupied the highest position and included those who stand out prominently as the great poets whose works have come down to our times. The second class were the family bards—the Teuleuwr. They were kept by the princes and chiefs in their palaces, just as chaplains were in olden times attached to the castles and mansions of English nobles. The third and the lowest class of bards were the *Clerwr*. These were the wandering and vagabond bards, really minstrels, who went about singing and gaining a livelihood by the charity of the chiefs and others, making a trade of bardism. This was a degeneration, a corruption, and an abuse of the noble profession of bardism.

According to Thomas Stephens the bards were very numerous—much more so than the remains of ancient poetry would indicate. There were bards mentioned in the course of history whose productions have entirely perished. In the twelfth century "Gwrgant ab Rhys ab Jestyn was the best and most learned bard of his time," but none of his productions have survived. The number of the degenerate bards had increased much up to the time of Edward the First. That monarch issued an order that the bards designated the westours, bards, rhymers, and other idlers and vagabonds, who lived upon the gifts called Cymmortha, should not be supported or sanctioned in the country, lest by their lies they should lead the common people to mischief. Some historians have stated that Edward put many bards to death, but Stephens contends that there is no truth in the charge. The order was directed against the wandering and degraded, not against the

orderly and genuine, bards who seem to have flourished at the time of the alleged massacre.

The bards and the clergy were not on the most friendly terms. Between the bards and the monks there existed a constant feeling of antagonism. The relation between them was something like that which prevailed among the Jews or Israelites between the priests and the prophets. The priests in both cases were jealous of the prophets and the bards. Priests in all countries claim supremacy over the minds of the people, and never permit any order of men—prophets or teachers—to interfere with that supremacy. The monks and priests of ancient Wales regarded the bards often as heretics. The mendicant friars were the objects of the wit of the bards and of the contempt of the people.

In olden times the chief bards, or some of them, claimed to be Druids and descended from them. According to the calm and reasonable conclusion of Thomas Stephens, in his "Literature of the Cymry" (page 104), there was no foundation for the claim. There was in the twelfth century a kind of Druidism founded on tradition and modified to suit the age, but it was not "the real Druidism of history." The ideas of Druidism influenced the bards and modified their theology. Mr. Stephens concludes his investigations by remarking that the Druidism of the twelfth century was confined to the bards; that it was of recent origin; that the bards, desirous of forming some exclusive distinction for themselves, seized upon the venerable tradition of Druidism and breathed new life into the old belief. The new order thus formed was numerous, or professed to be. In this new order the Druid and the bard were united—the bards being always members of the order. Mr. Stephens continues his criticism, and declares that the Druidism of the twelfth century was a bardic fiction and of recent origin, and that the Druidism even of that period did not exist as a form of worship. It existed only as a name and not as a reality. The bards did call themselves Druid-bards, and do at the present day. "There are societies of men who call themselves Druids in our large towns, but they are Druids in nothing but the name."

The greatest modern approximation to the ancient bards is the Royal National Eisteddfod of Wales. This institution is "the revival of those great assemblages of the Welsh bards which used to take place at the courts of the native princes of Wales. On such occasions they competed against each other in music and song. The modern Eisteddfod embraces also competition in literature and science and in art and industry." The gathering is of a national character, and serves the useful purpose of stimulating "culture, art, and thought, and encourages the Welsh people to develop the gifts they possess of oratory, music, and song. I know of no national institution coming down from the far-off past of which a people have greater reason to be proud." The Welsh word *Eisteddfod* signifies a sitting, a session—the congress of bards or literati. The word *Gorsedd*, which is prominent in their pro-

ceedings, denotes supreme seat, throne, and a court of law in ancient times. This Welsh institution is very popular in Wales and among the Welsh in the large towns of England. It has, of course, some faults, which in years gone by excited the adverse criticism of English journals ; but this has largely disappeared, and the proceedings are now reported in the London and provincial journals of England without any unfair criticism. The terms employed — Eisteddfod, Gorsedd, and Druid-bard — carry the minds of genuine Welshmen back to very ancient times, when their ancestors as Druids or bards assembled together and exhibited their literary power, their religious and philosophic thought, their poetic genius, and their music and song. The motto of the Eisteddfod is a noble one, "*Y Gwir yn erbyn y Byd*"—"The truth against the world." The Eisteddfod has not always exhibited the spirit of this mottto, especially when the leading men seemed to make historical truth subordinate to the glorification of the Welsh name and nation, as in their maintenance of the myth concerning Madoc as the discoverer of America in the twelfth century.

The bards have been divided by T. Stephens into two periods. The first period extends from A.D. 510 to A.D. 1080 ; the second period begins where the first ends and continues to A.D. 1400. The first period embraces the oldest poets, beginning with Aneurin, who flourished from A.D. 510 to 560, and followed by Taliesin from A.D. 520 to 570. On these ancient bards we dwelt in the early part of this work, and we have now to consider the character of those of the second period. Stephens mentions no less than eighty bards of this period who have left poems behind them. Most of these poems are printed in the "Myvyrian Archæology of Wales," collected out of ancient manuscripts.

The first poet or bard in this long list is Meilyr, who lived from A.D. 1080 to 1160, and he wrote three poems during a career of forty years—1120 to 1160. The first was an elegy on the great king of Gwynedd, or North Wales—Gruffydd ab Cynan—who died in the year 1137. The second was also an elegy on Trahaiarn and Meilyr. The former was king of Gwynedd for a few years in succession to his cousin, Bleddyn ab Cynvyn. He was defeated and slain in the great battle of Carno by Gruffydd ab Cynan, who succeeded to the throne of North Wales. The third was on the deathbed of Meilyr himself—the anticipation of his own death which was near. He was then an old man, and showed more poetic ability than in the first of his poems composed when a young man. We will give one verse in English of this poem taken from T. Stephens :—

> 'The king of Kings is accessible to be adored ;
> To my Lord supreme I will prefer a prayer,
> Sovereign of the region of necessity,
> The most exalted circle of bliss.
> Beneficent Being, make a reconciliation
> Betwixt Thee and me !"

The next bard in the list is the distinguished Gwalchmai,

whose career is placed from the year 1150 to 1190. He was the son of the poet Meilyr just described. There are twelve poems ascribed to him. They are mostly historical and composed in honour of Welsh princes, especially Owain Gwynedd, the son of Gruffydd ab Cynan, who succeeded to the sovereignty of North Wales as prince of North Wales in succession to his father in the year 1137, and reigned with great power and success till the year 1169. Gwalchmai addressed to Owain Gwynedd an ode on the victory gained by him over Henry II. of England at the battle of Tal-y-Maelevre. He also addressed other poems to Owain—five altogether. Apparently without any consistency, he composed two poems, one a panegyric on Madoc ab Meredydd, prince of Powys, and an elegy on him. This prince of Powys fought against Owain Gwynedd in the interest of the English king. Gwalchmai wrote other poems. As a small illustration of his poetic power, the following, taken from the poem in honour of Owain's victory, rendered into English by J. H. Parry and quoted by Woodward (pp. 272–3) :—

"The generous chief I sing of Rodri's line,
With princely gifts endow'd ; whose hand
Hath often curb'd the border land.
Owain, great heir of Britain's throne,
Whom fair ambition marks her own,
Who ne'er to yield to man was known,
Nor heaps he stones at Avarice's shrine."

This is the first verse in an ode composed in the twelfth century.

The bard Kynddelw flourished from A.D. 1150 to 1200, and was a contemporary of Gwalchmai. He was regarded as one of the most distinguished of the bards, and no less than forty-nine poems are ascribed to him. The designation of the great poet—Prydydd Mawr—was given to him. His poetic favours were given to several distinguished men—Owain Gwynedd, Madoc of Powys, Davydd ab Owain Gwynedd, and even to Llewelyn. In his poems there is something of the theosophy of the ancient bards. He, like other bards, was not friendly with the priests and monks, and was threatened with excommunication even in his last days. When the monks of Ystrad Marchell sent to tell him that his body should not be buried in their abbey, he sent in reply the following englyn :—

"If he had not promised to come against me,
And the blessed God knew it ;
It were more becoming in a monk
To demand, than to refuse my body."

When threatened with exclusion from the sacrament by the priests, the following, according to Stephens, erroneously ascribed to Merlin, was composed by Kynddelw :—

"I will not receive the sacrament
From excommunicated monks
With their togas on their knees ;
I will commune with God Himself.'

The sentiment expressed in the above is substantially the same as the modern Protestant principle that a man's religious life, and even salvation, depends not on human priests or on human mediators, but on his personal relation to Jesus Christ, the only Saviour, and through Him to God the Father. The above are given by T. Stephens—("The Literature of the Cymry," p. 119). The following is also from his poem to God :—

"One God prosperous, and righteous, a Sovereign
Who rules without fear ;
One Son of Mary, a dauntless Being ;
One eternal and merciful Deity ;
One King, Ruler of heaven and earth.
Before weakness, the condition of happy age overtakes me,
I will be God's servant in a banqueting-house without complaint
Before I become needy, with a mild necessity,
And life, age, and complexion give place to inanimation ;
Before the necessity of a merciful death,
And the mention of the azure hue of dissolution ;
Before the time for the great covering of the sky,
Before I am brought to the last prison ;
Before the cold closing-up, and the frigid funeral,
And the confinement in a dress of oak and gore—
I will devote my tongue to wise conversation,
And to unlimited and unceasing praise ;
I am the praiser of vigour in the garb of sadness,
I will praise God, the impartial in judgment ;
The joy of the heavenly angels will enliven me,
In Thy blessed state, and Thy blessed habitation."

The above must suffice as illustrations of the bardic power of Kynddelw, one of the greatest men of the twelfth century. To give here a description of his forty-nine poems would be impossible within our limits.

After Kynddelw follows Owain Cyveiliog, who composed two poems ; and Daniel ab Ll. Mew, two short poems. The former was a prince of Powys, and preferred his palace and his poetry to a war for the deliverance of the Holy City from the Saracens. The two poems of Cyveiliog—the "Hirlas Horn" and the "Circuit through Powys"—are esteemed the most remarkable productions of the twelfth century. The following verse translated by Mr. Fenton and recorded by Woodward :—

"To share the festal joy and song,
Owain's train we move along ;
Every passion now at rest
That clouds the brow or rends the breast ;
But oppression's foes the same,
Quick to kindle into flame.
Setting off from Mortyn, say,
Whither shall we bend our way ?"

Passing by Gwynvardd Brycheiniog—time A.D. 1160–1220, two poems—and Gwilym Ryvel of the same period, we note the eight poems of Howel ab Owain Gwynedd. He was the son of the great king, Owain Gwynedd, king of North Wales, or Gwynedd. Of the eight poems that have come down to us, six are love songs

and two are on war, for Howel was a warrior as well as a bard. The following from "Woodward's History" may suffice to indicate his poetic spirit :—

THE CHOICE.

"Give me the fair, the gentle maid,
Of slender form, in mantle green ;
Whose woman's wit is ever staid,
Subdued by virtue's graceful mien.
Give me the maid, whose heart with mine
Shall blend each thought, each wish combine .
Then, maiden, fair as ocean's spray,
Of Kymric speech, discreet, yet gay,
Thou shalt be mine.
Say, am I thine ?
What ? Silent thou ?
Thy silence makes my bosom glow.
I choose thee, maiden, for thy gifts divine ;
Thus is it right to choose ; then fairest,
Choose me thine.'

The time of his activity was from A.D. 1140 to 1172.

The next bard of importance is Llywarch ab Llewelyn, whose date was A.D. 1160 to 1220. He composed thirty-two long poems. According to T. Stephens, he was a bard of a very superior order. "His compositions are neither so numerous nor so various as the writings of Kynddelw, but in depth of feeling, power of delineation, and beauty of composition, they are much superior." He was called "The Poet of the Pigs," or "Prydydd y Moch." The poem "To the Hot Iron" was composed when he underwent the ordeal of the hot iron to disprove the charge made against him that he contributed to the death of Madoc of Powys. The following is a verse of this poem given by Woodward :—

"Good iron ! free me from the charge
Of slaying Madoc. Show that he
Who smote the prince with murderous hand,
Heaven's kingdoms mine shall never see,
Whilst I the dwelling place of God
Shall share, safe from all enmity."

This poet composed an ode to Davydd, the son of Owain Gwynedd ; another to Rhodri, son of Owain ; another to Llewelyn ab Iorwerth—historical—and several others to the same great prince. Stephens gives a portion of one of his poems in which he gives a description of the battle of Porth Aethwy in which Llewelyn the Great was the conqueror :—

"Llewelyn was our prince ere the furious contest happened,
And the spoils were eagerly divided ;
Purple gore ran over the snow-white of the warriors ;
And after the shout the havoc and carnage was general.
The parti-coloured waves flowed over the broken spear,
And the warriors were silent ;
The briny wave came with force,
And met on its way one mixed with blood."

We cannot give even samples of the compositions of the other bards. They continued onward to the end of the fourteenth century, and included among others, Davydd Bonvras, twelve poems; Meilyr ab Gwalchmai, eight poems; Bleddyn Vawr, thirteen short poems; finally, Gruffydd ab Adda ab Davydd y Malyn, about the year 1390; and several anonymous poems. Probably no other European people during the Middle Ages possessed so many native poems indicating power of thought as the Britons or Welsh. The poetic activity thus described passed away to a large extent after the loss of Welsh independence but the poetic spirit did not die, but has remained up to the present time. The Welsh are still a poetic and musical people, and this quality pervades the whole population and is not confined to a few or a class.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE CHURCH OF WALES

In an early part of this history we endeavoured to show that Christianity was introduced into Britain in the second century, probably in the latter half. Some old writers have laboured to prove that it was brought here in the first century, and some during the age of the apostles. The evidence for this contention is very feeble, founded on the uncertain identification of certain names among the Roman inhabitants of Britain and some found in the New Testament. Another supposed ground for this opinion is some mythical persons such as Bran, the father of Caradoc, or Caractacus, converted to Christianity when a prisoner at Rome; and Lucius, a supposed British king. These and other authors of British Christianity are now generally repudiated by critical historians. The opinion now generally held by competent writers is that Christianity came to Britain in the second century from Gaul. "Many considerations minister to the conclusion that it is to the Greek colony of Lyons that Britain owes the first foundation of its Church" (J. Pryce).

We have, however, here to do with the Welsh Church during the Middle Ages until it became absorbed in the Anglican Church under the Norman kings. That the ancient British Church was independent of the Church of Rome seems historically certain. The unsuccessful attempt of Augustine at the close of the sixth century to persuade the British Church to submit to the authority of the Roman Church is, of course, evidence of fact that it was independent. The Anglo-Saxons, when they invaded Britain and conquered the Britons, were a pagan people. Their gradual conversion by the Roman missionaries, Augustine and his successors, led to the creation of an Anglican Church in close communion with the Roman Church, but this was entirely distinct and separate from the Church among the Britons. When Augustine had interviews with the representatives of the Welsh Church, there were twelve questions of difference and difficulty which he placed before Pope Gregory and sought his direction in presenting them before the Britons. The disputes, however, were reduced to two regarded as tests of union and submission—the time of observing Easter and the mode of baptizing. Behind these questions was the most important, the Roman right of jurisdiction

over the British bishops, and this was really the most important question. It was objected to the British Christians that they did nothing to aid in the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity. The objection was, however, unreasonable. The Anglo-Saxons were the national enemies of the Britons, and war between them was almost incessant. Under these circumstances, the intercourse between them such as would be involved in the employment of means for evangelisation would be impossible. Moreover, a union between the Britons and Roman missionaries in such an agency would imply submission on the part of the Britons to the authority of the Roman Church.

The British Church remained for generations independent of Rome and of the Anglican Church formed by the Roman missionaries, though the dogmas and the practices of the Roman Church gradually spread among the British Christians, as they did through Europe generally ; but the organic unity and independence of the British Church was never entirely abandoned until its total absorption in the Anglican Church during the Norman period. The pope or Roman bishop had gained much influence and power over British as over other Churches during the dark ages, but no bishop of St. David's, considered the chief Welsh see, ever received the *pallium* from the hands of the pope. "The most strenuous resistance of the Welsh bishops was directed against the expression of their reverence to the pontiff through the archbishop of Canterbury. They would not own him as their metropolitan and primate, but claimed to have in St. David's an archiepiscopal see of their own" (W.). For many ages the Britons contended that their Church was independent in origin and authority. Gradually, however, after ages of resistance, the Welsh Church gave way and became one with the Anglican Church, and through it with the Church of Rome. In those days the superstitious opinion prevailed that salvation depended upon formal and organic union with the universal or Catholic Church and not on personal union with the Saviour through a living faith. This notion aided the process of amalgamation.

The celibacy of the clergy prevailed in the Roman Church from an early period, gradually established under the influence of ascetic conceptions and perverted views of nature and religion. In Wales, however, the enforcement of this injunction was resisted. The bishops and the clergy of Wales contended for their right to marry against the orders of Rome and Canterbury. According to Bund in his learned book, "The Celtic Church" (p. 294), the Welsh clergy were always non-celibates until after the conquest of the Welsh Church by Norman bishops. The marriage of the Welsh clergy was almost universal in the twelfth century, and even from early times up to the Reformation Welsh clergy married and maintained their right. This is an evidence of the practical independence of the Welsh Church, even under the pressure of the Roman and Anglican Churches.

There was an intimate connection between the Welsh and Irish

Churches in olden times. The conversion of Ireland is usually ascribed to St. Patrick. The first missionary to Ireland was Palladius, sent there by Pope Celestine. He was probably a monk of Brittany. His mission was not successful. To him succeeded Patrick in the fifth century, and he was assisted by British and other monks. The foundation was completed, but after the death of St. Patrick the work went backward and the people relapsed, to some extent, into paganism. In these circumstances Irish Christians applied to British or Welsh Christians for aid in the restoration or revival of Christianity in Ireland. Another mission was sent from Wales under the guidance of Saints David, Cadoc, and Gildas. The active spirit was Gildas. "So successful were his efforts that a new life was infused into the Irish Church, and thus the names of British saints became associated with what was virtually the replanting of the Faith in Ireland. But the results of the help thus given extended far beyond the limits of that country. The second order of Irish saints, whose ritual and monastic institutions were modelled after the pattern of those of the British Church, by their love of learning and their intense missionary zeal, raised Ireland to be for centuries one of the greatest centres of Christian civilisation" (J. Pryce).

St. Ninian was a Briton of the north, son of a Christian, said by tradition to have been a king in that British state known under the name of Cumbria and which embraced the district which extended from Cheshire to the Clyde. His royal descent is very doubtful. Ninian, however, visited Rome and received from the pope the order of bishop and a commission to go and be an apostle to his own people. He went accordingly to Galloway, or Galwidia, and there erected a cathedral, which he dedicated to St. Martin of Tours. This was the scene of his operations in Christianising the wild inhabitants of that region. A full account of his work and its results is wanting, but some conception may be formed of it from the fact that in over sixty-three districts of that country churches were dedicated to the name of Ninian. The see of Ninian disappeared after his death, but the work, though interrupted, was never abandoned.

St. Columba was an Irishman, and he became the apostle for the conversion of the Picts of Scotland. The work of converting the pagans of North Britain was done jointly by the Britons, beginning with St. Ninian and St. Kentigern, and the Irish commencing with St. Columba, St. Aidan, and others. St. Columba was the apostle of the Highlanders, and made the Isle of Iona his headquarters, where he established his monastery, from which proceeded his missionaries for the conversion of the inhabitants of the north. The two bands—the British and the Irish—co-operated harmoniously in the good work. The British laboured in the southern part of the country which now we call the north of England, and the Irish the northern, which now we call Scotland, but the boundary was not very strictly marked between them. St. Kentigern was the bishop of St. Asaph, and he was invited to

become the bishop of Glasgow by the monarch of Cumbria, Rhydderch Hael, whose kingdom then extended to the Clyde, and included Glasgow. There was cordiality between Kentigern and Columba. The conversion of the Picts was the joint work of the two bands of missionaries ; but the evangelisation of the Scots, or the Highlanders, was the work of St. Columba and his band. The Columban Order of monks became the most important in the evangelisation of the north of England and Scotland. These two bands of Celtic missionaries flourished in the sixth century and preceded the coming of Augustine to the Anglo-Saxons at the end of that century. The number of churches founded by St. Columba was great — said to be three hundred as marked out. He was also called the father and founder of monasteries, that is among the Picts and Scots and the Irish. Dr. Reeves identified thirty-seven in Ireland, thirty-two among the Scots, and twenty-four among the Picts. It is well known that the work of Augustine and his companions among the Anglo-Saxons was after their death nearly extinguished in the greater part of England, with the exception of Canterbury and the surrounding district. In these circumstances the successors of St. Columba and St. Ninian undertook the task of restoring Christianity in East Anglia and Northumbria, and it was to these Celtic missionaries that the conversion of England was mainly due, rather than to Augustine. It is remarkable that in Ireland the work of St. Patrick, and in England that of St. Augustine, was largely undone after their death, and the permanent conversion of both peoples was completed by the Celtic missionaries from Ireland and Britain. In those early ages Celtic missionaries, mostly monks, were very active, and travelled between Wales, Ireland, Brittany, and the west—Cornwall and Devon—and spread the Christian faith. This work has been overshadowed in history through the final conquest of Britain by the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans.

The method of spreading Christianity among the ancient Britons, as well as among the Irish, was by the establishment of monasteries as centres of operation. But we must not conceive of those monasteries as precisely the same as modern or Roman monasteries consisting entirely of monks, pledged to a life of celibacy. The ancient Celtic monastery was a settlement not confined to one sex or to monks. According to Bund, in his "Celtic Church," the monastery contained men and women up to A.D. 543. It was really a tribal settlement. Pryce ("The Ancient British Church," p. 183) remarks : "There is no feature more characteristic of the early Welsh saints than their connection with the kings or chieftains of the country. Their conversion, therefore, was naturally followed by that of their clansmen, and as they almost all embraced the monastic life, the corporate feeling of the clan passed by easy transition into the monastic form, the chieftain continuing, in the religious character of the abbot, to be still regarded as the head of his dependants. This will explain the number of the residents at particular monasteries."

F. Seebohm, in his able book, "The Tribal System in Wales," remarks (p. 204): "When, therefore, the episcopacy became, or was becoming, territorial in South Wales, difficulties arose naturally out of the geographical position of St. Teilo's settlements, which, though in the territory of St. David's, naturally belonged to Llandaff, of which St. Teilo was the saint."

But at the time of these donations there was no ground for such difficulties. What bishops there were, were not territorial. The Church in South Wales was monastic rather than episcopal, or, more correctly, the missionary work of the Church was carried on by the foundation of little monastic churches, or colleges of monks, some of whose members were bishops, but whose heads were abbots. And both the historical importance of these monastic churches and the time of their prevalence are marked by the fact that the system which had originally spread from Gaul, through Brittany into Wales, was carried over by the Irishman Ninian—who was a disciple of St. David, St. Gildas, and St. Cadoc—into Ireland, becoming there the second of the three orders of saints, viz., that immediately following the order of St. Patrick." This remark corresponds with the conclusions of Skene in his "Celtic Scotland" (vol. ii. c. ii.)

Mr. Bund, in his able book already mentioned, "The Celtic Church," observes that the *saint* in the ancient British Church was different from the saint of the Latin Church. The Celtic saint was a distinguished Christian during his life, and held in high esteem in the minds of Celtic Christians from generation to generation. In the Latin Church from the tenth century the saint was *made* by a decree of the pope. The process was called canonisation—a function of the pope which began in the tenth century. It was intended as honour or title conferred on the person thus made a saint *after* his death. The person thus honoured in the Latin Church was no doubt deemed to have rendered some service to the Church, but that was not necessarily the service of a holy life. Indeed, some of the so-called saints were not remarkable for their holy lives. The conception of the Celtic saint was that of a devout and holy Christian in actual life. This corresponded with the primitive description of saints as holy men and women in actual fellowship as a Church, such as is mentioned in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians i. 1., "To the saints which are at Ephesus." The estimate of such saintly lives may have been coloured in subsequent times, but such was the Celtic conception. Mr. Bund remarks that no Celtic saint was worshipped as the Latin saints officially made are. In the early ages, up to the seventh century, there were from four hundred to five hundred Welsh saints recognised, but after that period only five. The former were popular saints, not manufactured, but recognised as good men in the British Church from age to age, and connected with particular churches. St. David was esteemed as a holy man and bishop by the Welsh people from the time of his actual life in the sixth century. He was, however, more regarded in his own district

than in other parts of Wales. In the diocese of St. David there were forty-two old churches bearing the name of St. David, and eight in Llandaff; but, strange to say, none in North Wales, except modern ones. St. David was canonised in the year A.D. 1121, and after that he became the national saint of Wales, the symbol of nationality, not of a province, but of the entire British race. The British churches were in olden times not *dedicated* to saints until the Norman period. In olden times the churches bore the name of the saint or the founder of the monastery with which it was connected, or some saint of that monastery, but there was no special dedication to saints until the Norman period. The cathedral of St. David was dedicated to St. Andrew in the year 1121, and that of Llandaff to St. Peter in the year 1120. The introduction of Latin names to churches was due to the Normans. In the Flemish district of Pembrokeshire twenty-nine out 123 churches bore the name of the Virgin Mary, but in the Welsh districts of Caermarthen and Cardigan there were only five or six Mary churches. Of the churches and chapels in Wales mentioned by Rees, 520 are called *Llan*, the Welsh word for church. So Bund states from the best authorities.

According to the same author (page 322), there were no parishes, in the strict sense of the term, in Wales during the purely Welsh period, but were created by the Normans, and probably not before the time of Henry VIII. There were churches bearing certain names, but no *parish* churches. As a consequence, we may easily understand that *tithes* as legal compulsory payments were unknown in Wales in olden times. They were established in Wales about the year 1172. They existed in England some centuries earlier, but in Wales they were due to the Norman power. The same thing may be said of the Welsh dioceses. Their present territorial character is due mainly to the Normans. The Normans turned the Celtic monastic episcopacy into Latin territorial dioceses. The Celtic position was, the tribe was supreme and the Church was subordinate. The Latin position established by the Normans was, the Church was supreme and the State subordinate.

These remarks lead us to the consideration of the Welsh bishoprics. It has been shown in preceding parts of this history that in ancient times bishops were numerous among the Britons, even in the tenth century, when a large number of them were gathered together in the conference which formed the Ancient Laws of Wales by Howel Dda. It has been shown by competent authors that the diocesan episcopacy, as we know it and as it existed in the Roman Church, was the creation of the Normans in Wales, bringing the Welsh Church gradually into formal union with the Anglican Church. And yet there are some candid writers, such as J. Pryce of Bangor, who maintain that there was in ancient times in Wales a diocesan episcopacy, as well as a monastic one. Every monastery had a bishop deemed essential to its right government and to the salvation of its inmates, though he was

subject to the supreme power of the abbot. These bishops were missionary officers. There were also diocesan bishops, according to Mr. Pryce, in the ancient British Church, but this is against the conclusions of such authors as Seebohm and Bund, and is certainly doubtful. In all probability the ancient episcopacy in Wales gradually assumed a position which more and more approximated to that of the regular diocesan episcopacy until the two became one under the power of the Normans. The bishops of the Anglican type came in along with the Norman nobles, and the diocesan system was gradually established and completed over the whole of Wales when the conquest of the entire country took place. The great bishoprics ultimately became territorial and diocesan after the Latin and Anglican type and superseded the others. In the Roman period, even among the Britons, the chief bishoprics were established in the Roman towns of importance whose central position and political importance made them suitable. The British bishops who attended the first council of Arles in the year 314 represented York, London, and Caerleon-on-Usk. The last of the three was within what became in after times Wales as distinguished from England.

The most ancient bishopric in Wales was at Caerleon, the Roman station of the noted second legion which, in the Roman period, kept in order the Silures of Gwent and also garrisoned the important places of Gloucester and Cirencester. The place declined after the departure of the Romans and has been reduced to the dimensions of a village. The bishopric continued for a while and was subsequently superseded by St. David's. The bishopric of Caerleon has been designated by some historians as an archbishopric. This was probably inferred from the fact that it was associated in the fourth century with York and London, and from the opinion that the Church in many places made the Roman capital of a province the seat of an archbishop. The opinion, however, was not well founded and did not exist until the twelfth or thirteenth century (J. Pryce). No such opinion existed in the time of Geoffrey of Monmouth or Giraldus, who lived in the twelfth century; nor is there any indication of such an opinion in the "Life of St. David," by Rhyddmarch, written in the eleventh century, the original Life of the saint. It is certain that during the Roman period Caerleon was the seat of the only bishopric in Wales except perhaps monastic ones, and that no jurisdiction over other sees could be exercised, such as is implied in the nature of an archbishopric. This ancient bishopric in the sixth century was transferred to Menevia, called afterwards St. David's, after the distinguished saint who was its first bishop, or, as represented by Archdeacon Pryce of Bangor, the see was subdivided into those of St. David's, Llanbadarn, and Llandaff—a readjustment to correspond with the districts into which the southern principality was then being divided.

The bishopric of St. Davids was thus created in the sixth century as the successor of that of Caerleon. According to

Rhyddmarch, the foundation of this see was due to St. David himself, though there seems some indication that there was at old Menevia a bishop of some kind at the head of an establishment before the time of St. David. Bishops then and for ages afterwards were numerous, and were of the character denominated as monastic bishops, not diocesan. The noted bishoprics that we know are the survivals of many, and became in course of time diocesan or territorial, which they were not originally. This see became in time the bishopric for Dyfed, or Pembrokeshire, Caermarthenshire, Cardiganshire, parts of Brecknockshire and Radnorshire. The bishopric of Llanbadarn Vawr was created in the sixth century, and continued to the eighth century, when it was merged into the see of St. David's. Its founder and first bishop was Padarn. It was believed that he was a native of Brittany, who came to Wales in the year 512 along with 847 monks, and founded this bishopric obviously as a monastic one. He was associated with Saints David and Teilo, and accompanied them in their journey to Jerusalem. He returned to his native country, thence, in consequence of trouble from his brethren, departed to the Franks, where he died in the period 550–560. His bishopric was intended for the principality of Caredigion, or only the northern part and portions of the adjoining districts or counties. Then it was absorbed in the more noted see of St. David soon after certain great troubles in the year 720. St. David, the founder of the bishopric which bears his name, was represented in the legendary accounts of ancient times as connected with royal persons, such as they were then ; that he performed many miracles and lived to a great age—nearly 150 years. This, of course, is mythical. It is, however, historical that after a long and useful life he died on the 1st of March, 601. He was canonised by Pope Celestine in the year 1121. He thus became, not the humble bishop of Menevia, but the patron saint of Wales. St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland, was said to have had some connection with St. David.

The bishopric of Llandaff was established also in the sixth century in succession to that of Caerleon ; as previously mentioned, the old bishopric was subdivided, and Llandaff became an important offshoot. This see became associated with the principality of Gwent, or modern Monmouthshire, and ultimately with the entire kingdom of Morganwg. The history of this see is given in the "Llyfr Teilo," or the "Liber Laudavensis," in which, however, there is much controversial and doubtful matter. There are two great names associated with the early history of this bishopric. They are Dubricius and Teilo. The British name of Dubricius was Dufrig or Dyvrig Beneurog. The account of his birth given by Geoffrey of Monmouth and others is largely mythical. His coming into the world was attended with miracles of a somewhat ridiculous nature. He was also made to be connected with St. Germanus, and also with King Arthur, in whose coronation he took a part. The dates do not agree. The second visit of

Germanus to Britain was in the year 447, but this was long before the time of Dubricius. He was the first bishop of Llandaff. According to some accounts, St. Germanus consecrated him to the see of Llandaff, and soon after he was made archbishop of Caerleon and primate of all Wales. This account involves confusion of dates, and transfers to that period the ideas of much later times. The first Life of Dubricius was written in the twelfth century, about 600 years after the time of the saint, after many legends had grown around his memory. In order to remove the discrepancy as to time involved in the consecration by St. Germanus of the saint, he has been represented in Welsh traditions as having lived to over a hundred and fifty years. The fact is the wonderful life of Dubricius was mainly a myth. There was such a man as Dubricius who became the first bishop of Llandaff; he probably did resign his office in favour of Teilo and retired to the Isle of Bardsey, on the coast of Caernarvon, to lead the life of a recluse or a monk, where he died, probably in the year 612, at a good old age and was there interred. In the year 1120 his remains were removed from the island to Llandaff. This was a time when superstition invested the bones of supposed saints with peculiar sacredness by which even miracles might be performed.

The successor of Dubricius as bishop of Llandaff was his disciple Teilo. He was a friend of St. David and accompanied him and Paternus, or Padarn, in their visit to Jerusalem. When there, the patriarch of Jerusalem was said to have made a trial which of the three visitors was the humblest and, therefore, most fit for the episcopal office. The result was in favour of Teilo, but according to Rhyddmarch the decision was in favour of St. David. The story is, of course, a mythical invention created some hundreds of years afterwards. When he returned home he found that the dreadful yellow plague was raging, which tradition reports was stayed by his prayer. The people, however, were terrified and many fled from the country. On his return to Llandaff he gathered together his people, who had been scattered. There were two or three visitations of this scourge, as previously described—the first in the year 547, and the second, the most fatal, was in the year 664. Teilo was regarded as a great saint and a distinguished bishop, and when he died three places contended for his body—Llandaff, Llandeilo Vawr, and Tenby. So tradition says, but not truly.

The two bishopries thus described in South Wales have survived to the present time, and are the territorial sees for the whole of the south, including Monmouthshire. In North Wales there are also two which have survived the vicissitudes of time. They are Bangor and St. Asaph, of which we now proceed to give a short description.

The bishopric of Bangor was created in the sixth century. According to the common account, the founder and the first bishop was Deiniol Wyn, or Daniel. He was the son of Dynawd Fawr.

The early history of the bishopric is little known. The traditional account is that Dynawd and his sons were united in the formation of the monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, in Flintshire; but this could hardly have been the case, as this celebrated monastery had existed as a great educational and monastic establishment long before their time. Deiniol, who was connected with the celebrated monastery, founded a school in Caernarvonshire for the education of youth, and gave to the place the name of Bangor, afterwards, designated Bangor-Fawr to distinguish it from other Bangors. This school was shortly afterwards erected into the bishopric of Bangor. The date of this event may be judged from the time of Deiniol's death, which took place in the year 584. He was interred in the island of Bardsey, then considered a sacred island, where saints retired in old age to spend their last days in contemplation and to die in peace. Nothing of importance is known of the bishopric from the time of Deiniol until the eighth century, when it came under the notice of the princes of Gwynedd, or North Wales. The most distinguished bishop of Bangor in the eighth century was Elbodius, or Elfod. This bishop has been designated in the "Annales Cambriæ" archbishop of Gwynedd, and also in the "Brut y Tywysogion," but without sufficient reason. The see gradually came to be regarded as specially belonging to Gwynedd and as partaking of the importance of that kingdom; but an archbishopric it never was. Their bishop died in the year 809. The bishopric has continued as the most important in North Wales up to this time.

The bishopric of St. Asaph was created also in the sixth century. The respected founder was Kentigern, or Cyndeyrn. The mythological history constructed by the superstitious ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages made him to be the grandson of a king of Cumbria who was a heathen. His father was unknown, but his mother was a Christian who was subjected to many perils because of her religion but was miraculously preserved. The British inhabitants of Cumbria, however, were Christians, and would not be likely to persecute a lady of position because she was a Christian. The entire story is, of course, a myth, characteristic of the monkish tales of the Middle Ages, which commonly surrounded ancient saints with miracles and martyrdom inconsistent with the times and circumstances in which they lived. According to the story, Kentigern was a Briton, a native of the northern British kingdom of Cumbria—Strathclyde. According to another account, he was the son of a princess belonging to the Picts of Scotland or those of Galloway adjoining Cumbria. There is not any reliance to be placed on the details of either account. It has been recorded that he became bishop of Glasgow when only twenty-five years of age, but was afterwards driven from Scotland by persecution, and he fled to Menevia. There he became the friend of St. David and both united in Christian work and became shining lights to the people. Then Kentigern by entreaty retired to North Wales, where he established a school and a church which became a

monastery in a situation at the junction of the rivers Clwyd and Elwy, hence the church of Llan Elwy. This monastery became a bishopric, and Kentigern was made the bishop. He did not remain long in this bishopric. He was induced by Rhydderch Hael, the king of Strathclyde, to return to the north, and he became the bishop of Glasgow. Here he remained during the rest of his life and died in the year 612 at a great age, and his name has remained under the form of Mungo in Scotland, where several churches were dedicated to him and seven in Cumberland. No church was ever dedicated to him in Wales, indicating that his work was mainly among the Scotch and the Britons of the north.

When Kentigern left North Wales for Glasgow, Asaph, said to have been his disciple, was appointed to succeed him as bishop. One account states that he was appointed by Kentigern himself, another more probable account represents him as unanimously elected, implying the action of the entire body of men in whom the power was vested. The name of the bishopric was subsequently changed from Llan Elwy to that of St. Asaph, the name of the second bishop. For some centuries after this time the history of St. Asaph bishopric is a blank. In the tenth century one of its bishops, Cebur, was mentioned as accompanying the great king, Howel Dda, to Rome. In the eleventh century another of its bishops was mentioned—Bledud. The see comes into notice in Norman times in connection with ecclesiastical disputes. The see was spoken of by Giraldus Cambrensis as a poor and insignificant one—"paupercula ecclesia."

These four bishoprics are the survivals of the ancient Welsh bishoprics of various kinds, monastic and otherwise. As previously shown, the bishops of olden times in Wales were numerous. In the synod of Llandewi Breh, held in the sixth century under St. David, there were present 119 bishops; and in the great assembly called by Howel Dda at the White House in Caermarthenshire in the tenth century to consolidate the Ancient Laws of Wales which bear his name, there were present 140 bishops. There were eight living in the see of Llandaff during the lifetime of Teilo. There were seven bishop-houses in Dyfed mentioned in the Ancient Laws of Wales. These facts show that in olden times bishops were numerous and could not have been diocesan. Their function seemed to correspond to the primitive office of the bishop, the επισκοπος, or overseer, or superintendent. They were the spiritual overseers of schools, colleges, and monasteries, which in those ancient times were largely missionary establishments, the centres of Christian light and life. The diocesan bishoprics sprang out of these in the course of time and gradually superseded them.

The schools or colleges and monasteries with which the numerous bishops were connected were established in many parts of Wales. In the earliest period schools were established at Henllan, or Hentland, and Mochros, in South Wales, and Dubricius was the superintendent. The traditional account

alleges that at Henllan there were one thousand scholars from every part of the country, and the figures are also given as two thousand and "all clerics." The numbers have been, of course, exaggerated. There was also a college at Caerleon ascribed to Dubricius. The Welsh saint, who bore the name of Iltutus, or Illtyd, was at the head of several schools of note frequented by "the sons of the British nobility." Paulinus, or Pawl Hen, founded the school which was also the monastery of Ty Gwyn ar Daf, or Whitland, in Caermarthenshire, where, according to tradition, Saints David and Teilo went to study the Scriptures under him. In the district of Llandaff there were three celebrated monastic schools, viz., Llancarfan, Caerworgorn, and Docwinni. The first of these—Llancarfan—was founded by St. Cadoc and was situated near Cowbridge. In North Wales the following monastic schools were formed. The noted one on the river Dee, Bangor-Iscoed, was very ancient. It is believed that here Pelagius was educated in the latter half of the fourth century. According to the traditional account there were over two thousand pupils or monks in this monastery. In the battle of Chester, in the year 613, nearly all were slain by the Anglo-Saxon army under Æthelfrith. In Caernarvonshire there was the monastic establishment at Clynnog Fawr, founded in the seventh century by St. Beuno, who obtained the land from the king of North Wales, Cadwallon, the son of Cadvan. In Anglesey, the monastery of Caergybi, called after the founder Cybi. Tradition reports that he received the land from the great king of North Wales, Maelgwn Gwynedd, who flourished in the early part of the sixth century. The religious house of Llanelwy, out of which the bishopric of St. Asaph arose, contained 965 monks at one time, of which 365 were said to be engaged in divine worship and the rest were engaged in labour and domestic employment. The above were only a few of the many schools and scholastic monasteries which were spread over the country—local centres of light and holiness. The records of most of them have perished and the information concerning the others is small.

The independence of the ancient Church of the Britons has been shown in previous parts of this work. This Church, unlike the Anglican, did not owe its origin to Roman agency. In all probability Christianity came to Britain in the first instance from the south of Gaul, from the Christian community that existed in the second century among the Greek colonies on the shores of the Mediterranean, Lyons, and other places. The form of early British Christianity was more Greek than Roman, and this was adhered to for several centuries, especially in regard to the time of observing Easter. The Roman missionary, Augustine, sent by Pope Gregory the Great to convert the Anglo-Saxons at the close of the sixth century, found among the Britons an ancient Church independent of the Roman Church. He endeavoured to convince the bishops of this Church to conform to the practices of the Western Church and to submit to the authority of the pope. In his two interviews

with them he failed to convince the Britons. His successors, Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus, more conciliatory than Augustine, also failed to induce the British Christians to abandon their practices and surrender their independence. This independence they maintained until they were gradually conquered by the Norman princes. The non-Roman practices referred to were observed by the Christians of Ireland and by those of the north belonging to the Columban Church. The whole of the Celtic Churches in Britain and Ireland observed the same practices as to Easter and the tonsure, which were more Greek than Roman.

In tracing through several centuries the gradual change in the Celtic Churches by which they ultimately surrendered their independence and conformed to the practices of the Roman or Western Church, we can only indicate a few events which may be regarded as stages in the history of the movement. The controversy as to the time of observing Easter was an old one. The Western Church contended that the death of Christ should be commemorated on a Friday, on the 14th day of the Hebrew month of Nisan, if it fell on a Friday; but if not, on the following Friday, and Easter Day the following Sunday. The Churches of the East, now represented by the Greek Church, maintained that the 14th day of the month of Nisan should be the day of celebration whether it fell on a Friday or any other day of the week. These Eastern Christians were designated in the controversy Quarto-decimans, because they adhered to the 14th day of the month. Another difference between the two churches was in the tonsure, or the shaving of the head, as the first ceremony of dedication to the priesthood. In the Roman or Western Church, the crown of the head only was shaved. The circle of hair left was supposed to represent the crown of thorns. In the Celtic Church the head was shaved from one ear to another across the front of the head—"*ab aure ad aurem*." There were other differences of usages in these Churches relating to the administration of baptism, the ritual of the mass, and the consecration of bishops, but the two mentioned were regarded as the most important. On these small differences the Churches divided. The British Churches followed the Eastern Churches, especially in the observance of Easter.

At the Synod of Whitby, in the year 664, the questions in dispute were discussed and determined. The king of Northumbria, Oswin, was present, and took an active part in the discussion and the decision. The two parties in the dispute on the Easter question were the representatives of the Columban or North British Church led by Bishop Colman; and those of the English Church led by Agilbert and Wilfrid, afterwards archbishop of York. The arguments in support of the British usages advanced by Colman were met by the contempt of Wilfrid. The conduct of the king on the English side decided the matter in favour of the Roman practices. Bishop Colman and the other North British representatives were not convinced by the authoritative treatment

of the questions and returned home. Nevertheless, the decision of the Synod contributed to the ultimate settlement of the questions. In the early part of the eighth century the Anglican Church brought over the Christians of the Pictish district of the north by persuasion according to Bede, but most probably by the will and order of the king, Nechtan, as mentioned in the Annales. The change was against the will of the native clergy, who were expelled to make room for the partisans of the Roman practices. The Columban monks of Iona resisted the change for a few years, but in the year 716 they submitted to the Roman time of observing Easter and two years later that of the coronal tonsure.

The same progress was made among the Britons. When West Wales, or Somersetshire and Devonshire, were conquered by the English king, the Welsh Church in that region came under English power and conformed to the Roman usages in relation to Easter and the tonsure, and to this extent submitted to the Roman authority, as expressed in the Anglican Church. The bishop of Bangor, Elbodius, or Elfod, in the year probably of 768, persuaded the Churches of Gwynedd, or North Wales, to conform to the Western or Roman usages on the points in dispute. The conviction then prevailed that salvation depended upon relation not to Christ by a personal and living faith but to the Church, and refusal to conform to that Church placed them outside the pale of salvation. This contributed to the final acceptance of the Roman usages. The South Wales Churches, however, declined to submit. The result was a military conflict in which the English aimed at enforcing the Roman usages on the English Church in South Wales. A battle took place near Hereford which was in favour of the Welsh, but a Welsh bishop was slain, whose name was Cyfelach, according to the Gwentian form of the "Brut y Tywysogion," referred to by J. Pryce (p. 250). The gradual triumph of the Roman and Anglican party in this contest could not, however, be arrested. The South Wales bishops and Churches gave way about the year A.D. 777 and accepted the Roman practices on the insignificant questions of the time of observing Easter and the tonsure. The change was not accepted cordially and from conviction, and the new practices came into general use very slowly. Indeed, on the death of Bishop Elfod, the great advocate of the change, in the year 809, the bishops of St. David's and of Llandaff endeavoured to restore the old time of observing Easter, but the attempt failed.

The progress of the English conquest of Wales resulted gradually in the adoption by the Welsh Church of the Roman and Anglican ritual and in submission to the authority of the archbishop of Canterbury. The change was very gradual. In the latter half of the ninth century—A.D. 874—a Saxon of the name of Hubert, or Lambert, was consecrated as bishop of St. David's by the archbishop of Canterbury, whose name was Ethelred, as the successor of Einion. The fact, however, is no evidence that this appointment was recognised as legal and regular. The aim

of the Anglican Church for ages was to induce the Welsh Church to submit to the authority of Canterbury, the head of the Roman Church in England. Every opportunity was taken to bring this about directly or indirectly. The Welsh Church in South Wales at this time had suffered much even from the king of Dyfed, and this probably influenced many to suffer the interference of the archbishop of Canterbury backed as he was by Alfred the Great. This action of Canterbury was not permanent and cannot be regarded as an illustration of an established rule or of rightful authority, for the successors of Hubert were not consecrated by the archbishop. The interference of Canterbury in the consecration of bishops in South Wales again took place about the end of the tenth century; but though for the time submitted to, it was not recognised as the exercise of a right. There was not the same antagonism between the two Churches as formerly, for we find that the bishop of St. David's, whose name was Trahaiarn, acted as the assistant of the bishop of Hereford—Æthelstan—who was blind. This was in the eleventh century. This was an act of brotherly kindness, but there was no question of authority involved. The independence of the Welsh Church was maintained. The question assumed a different form, however, under the Normans. As the Norman power advanced in Wales, the Anglican ecclesiastical power encroached more and more. The entire conquest of Wales by the Norman kings resulted in the subjugation of the Welsh Church to that of England.

The strong-minded archbishops of Canterbury who were appointed under the Norman dynasty asserted formally their claim to supreme jurisdiction over the Welsh Church and bishops, and of course they were supported by the civil power. In former times the direct claims were not made and were not recognised. Now the circumstances were different. The learned Anselm, the author of the profound *à priori* argument for the existence of God, occupied the episcopal throne of Canterbury at the close of the eleventh century, and he asserted the highest claims of his bishopric over Wales as well as England. Wilfrid, or Gruffydd (his Welsh name), was made bishop of St. David's in the year 1083 in succession to Sulien by Norman influence, but in the year 1095 he was suspended by Anselm, though subsequently restored. There are, however, two different accounts of the matter. The incident shows the growing power claimed and exercised by Canterbury. About the end of the eleventh century, Anselm placed the bishop of Llandaff, whose name was Herwald, under an interdict. He carried his authority so far as to forbid the recognition of those ordained by him, thus overriding the power and episcopal arrangements of the Welsh bishop. In the year 1107 the bishop of Llandaff professed obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury. In the year 1112 or 1115 Henry I. appointed his chaplain, Bernard, to be bishop of St. David's in succession to Wilfrid, and as a matter of course he promised obedience to Canterbury, which he had previously agreed to do. These inci-

dents show the progress of the Norman power over Wales, politically and ecclesiastically, but they indicate clearly that the claim of supremacy was an usurpation against the ancient customs and the will of the people. In the year 1120 the bishop of Bangor, whose name was David, also recognised the supremacy of Canterbury. In the year 1092 Harvey became bishop of Bangor against the will of the Welsh people. He was removed to Ely, where he remained bishop from 1109 to 1131. In the year 1137 Gilbert, an Englishman, was made bishop of St. Asaph by the archbishop of Canterbury, with the consent of Owain Gwynedd, the great prince of North Wales, and in the year 1143 he formally acknowledged the supremacy of Canterbury. In this gradual and incidental way the independence of the Welsh Church was undermined by the action of the Norman kings and bishops forced upon the Welsh people.

The independence of the Welsh Church was still maintained by the Welsh people and its dependence on Canterbury was strongly resisted. The great Welshman, known as Giraldus Cambrensis, who flourished in the twelfth century, was a powerful defender of the independence of the Welsh Church. He was archdeacon of St. David's, and on the death of his uncle David was elected bishop by the canons of St. David's in the year 1176, but his succession was opposed by the English king, Henry II., and Peter de Leia was chosen to the office. After the death of de Leia in A.D. 1199, Giraldus was again candidate for the office on which he had set his heart, and he was elected by the canons, but the king and archbishop of Canterbury would not sanction the appointment on the ground that "the king would have no Welshmen, and especially no kinsman of the Welsh princes, a bishop in Wales." The struggle continued for five years. In 1203 the appeal to the pope resulted in the final rejection of Giraldus. Then Giraldus made a final request that the ancient independence of St. David's might be confirmed. The powers of the Norman king and the pope were against him, and in the year 1207 the pope, Innocent III., exhorted all the Welsh bishops to submit to the archbishop of Canterbury.

At the close of the twelfth century—A.D. 1188—Archbishop Baldwin made a tour through Wales, accompanied by the justiciary and also by Giraldus, for the purpose of preaching the Crusade for the deliverance of Jerusalem from the Saracens. He visited all the Welsh cathedrals and, without asking permission, celebrated at the altar as supreme bishop. It is generally considered that one of his main objects was to assert and promote the dependence of the Welsh bishoprics on Canterbury.

The Welsh Church was, like the English, deemed a portion of the Latin or the Roman Church, and the pope was appealed to in disputed questions between the English and the Welsh. The union was not very definite and the connection was very loose, even in the Middle Ages. The spirit of local independence was still cultivated and the rights of the national Church were main-

tained. In the early ages of British ecclesiastical history the authority of the Roman Church was denied and repudiated. This has been shown on previous pages. This was strikingly exhibited in the interviews between Augustine and the British bishops at the end of the sixth century. This independence was long maintained, but gradually the supremacy of the pope came to be acknowledged, even by Welsh bishops, though the limitations of that supremacy in actual exercise were recognised. The dogmatic teaching and the ritual of the Roman Church were recognised in Wales. The superstition and priestly power of what we now in modern times call popery did prevail in the Welsh Church in the ages preceding the entire conquest of the country. In Wales during those ages the peculiar teaching and spirit of the Roman Church were recognised in a loose and indefinite manner, but recognised they were. The great struggle of the Welsh Church was for centuries against the supremacy of the English Church as represented by the archbishop of Canterbury. The archbishop did doubtless represent the Roman Church, but the Welsh Church never freely recognised the supremacy of Canterbury.

The movement for the supremacy of Canterbury went on during the Norman period and fluctuated with the conquest over the native princes. This conquest was long only partial and local. In South Wales the barons on behalf of the English kings made greater progress in their conquests over the native princes than in North Wales, and in this part of Wales the English Church gained her earliest and greatest victories. North Wales gave way in some particulars, but not until the final conquest by Edward I. did the English Church bring the Welsh Church entirely within the fold.

The antagonism between the two Churches for several centuries arose partly from race hatred. The intercourse between the Welsh and English people was for many ages mainly of a warlike nature. From the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons onward there was a bitter race hatred, or a hatred between the conquerors and the conquered. The conquest of England by the Normans did not abate the feeling. The Normans brought greater energy into the government of England and that energy was directed to the conquest of the entire island. The policy of the Norman kings and their successors was to stamp out the national character of the Welsh people with a view to their thorough assimilation to their English subjects. They succeeded ultimately in the entire conquest of Wales, but they did not destroy the nationality of the people. By means of the conquest they forced the English Church upon the Welsh people, and for generations afterwards appointed English bishops to Welsh sees who were ignorant of the Welsh language, aliens in blood and sentiment, who sought their own material interests and acted as a hostile garrison for their masters, the English kings. The consequence was a common race hatred. It was made an objection to the appointment of a Welshman to any office, even that of a bishop, that he was a

Welshman. In the year 1199 Hubert, the archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to the pope, Innocent III., to dissuade him against the appointment to the see of St. David's of the noted scholar, Giraldus Cambrensis, and the reason assigned was that he was a Welshman related to many of the great princes of Wales. The Welsh princes wrote to this pope in the year 1203 seeking protection against this injustice. No wonder the Welsh people hated the English in those days and opposed so long the subordination of their Church to the supremacy of Canterbury. The subjection of the Welsh Church was gradually accomplished as the country was gradually conquered by the Normans. These two processes went on contemporaneously. The absorption of the Church followed the conquest of the country.

The union of Church and State existed practically in ancient times. Even amongst the Welsh the king or the prince claimed supreme power in ecclesiastical affairs. This became more evident in the government of the Normans in England and Wales. The theory of Church establishments as we understand it in modern times, may not have been very clear among our ancestors, but the practice of the union was certain. The conception of a Christian Church as a spiritual body possessing the prerogatives of self-government and acting on the spiritual nature of individual men apart from political and civil organisation, hardly existed among Welshmen or Englishmen in ancient times. Hence it came to pass that the conquest of the Welsh people involved the destruction of the Welsh Church as a separate institution and its absorption in the Anglican Church. As Wales for many ages had several states governed by separate princes and lacked national unity, the conquests in Church and State were gradual, extending over several generations, and they came to completion by the conquest of North Wales by Edward I. Henceforth Church and State were one in England and Wales.

CHAPTER XXX

WALES IN THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

The entire conquest of Wales was effected by Edward the First in the year 1283. The historian, Warrington, who wrote the "History of Wales" in the eighteenth century, remarks (vol. ii. p. 289): "The death of David closed the only sovereignty which remained of the ancient British empire—an empire which through various changes of fortune had opposed the arms of imperial Rome and for more than eight hundred years had resisted the utmost efforts of the Saxon and Norman princes." The Britons or Welsh for all those ages struggled against great odds to maintain their independence—almost the only instance in Europe of such a gallant and prolonged resistance under immense disadvantages. The brave and heroic conduct of this ancient race cannot but excite the admiration of all true students of ancient history. The loss of their independence was the source of great lamentation to the Welsh of the olden times; and some of their descendants in these days would wish to restore a partial independence under another name. The wish is, however, vain. The day of small and feeble nationalities is gone by.

That the conquest of Wales was attended by great cruelties inflicted by the conquerors cannot be denied. War even in modern times is a cruel thing, and many shocking deeds are done by modern nations in the prosecution of their warlike operations. Such cruelties were tenfold greater in the wars and conquests of ancient times. It may not be possible to defend the great majority of wars and conquests on the basis of righteousness, either natural or Christian. In most cases the less said about justice in connection with conquests the better. There are, of course, two sides to every question, and even to war. The one party is more guilty than the other, and both may be blamable. The conduct of the Romans, of the Anglo-Saxons, and of the Normans in invading this country cannot be justified on any sound moral principle. The Anglo-Saxons were treated by the Normans as they treated the Britons. The people who complain of injustice and violence at the hands of others have themselves been guilty of similar deeds in the treatment of their predecessors. The Normans were cruel in their conquest of the English, but the English were equally cruel in their conquest of the Britons.

Human history has largely consisted of the records of wars, arising from the ambition of men in some instances and in others from the migration of tribes and races seeking new and better homes for themselves. In modern times the migration of men to new homes is the result of arrangement and the consent of the peoples who occupy the countries sought ; but even in this age such is only partially the case, and the barbarous inhabitants are often displaced or subdued. In ancient times migrations were common by whole tribes and races and their progress was opposed by the aboriginal inhabitants and cruel war was the result. The great Aryan race migrated from the east to Europe and populated the countries, conquering their non-Aryan predecessors who resisted their progress. According to the prevalent opinion of modern scholars, the Celts were the vanguard in this mighty movement extending over a long period.

For a long time the Welsh people held the opinion that they were the original inhabitants of Britain, and when they migrated from Gaul here they found the country uninhabited by human beings. This, of course, was not the case, as pointed out in an early part of this work. There were, according to some critical historians, several races anterior to the coming of the Celts. There certainly was one race, denominated the Iberians, a non-Aryan people, a remnant of whom existed in the time of Cæsar as the Silurian tribes of South Wales—mainly in Monmouthshire and the adjoining districts. When the Celts came they found these people in the possession of the country and war ensued. The Celts ultimately conquered the aboriginal Iberians and finally destroyed or absorbed them in the course of time. The remnants of this ancient race are seen in the dark and small people now mixed with the Welsh inhabitants. Thus the earliest wars and conquests in Britain were by the ancient Britons—the Welsh—against the earlier occupiers of the land. Again, the Celtic immigrants were of two branches—the Goidels, represented by the Irish and the Highland Scotch—the Gaels ; and the Brythons, sometimes confounded with the Cymry. The Goidels, or Gaels, were the first division of the Celts who came and occupied this country and conquered the Iberians. Long afterwards the other branch of the Celts came over to this country, and their progress was opposed by the Goidels of the same race and speaking substantially the same language. War was the consequence. The Brythons drove the Goidels farther and farther into the interior. In those prehistoric times Wales was the battle-ground of the two branches of the Celtic race. The Goidels were driven farther and farther towards the shores of the Irish Sea and finally to Ireland. The Cymry were originally a British tribe who occupied the north, then called Cumbria. They were a strong and warlike tribe and in the fifth century—A.D. 400 to 450—under their great leader, Cunedda, and his sons, they invaded North Wales and succeeded in conquering the Goidelic inhabitants who oppressed the Brythons. About this time the two branches of the race occupied

different parts of the country. The Cymry peopled the state of Powys in North Wales, of which the centre was Montgomeryshire; and the Goidels, Gwynedd and Mona. In South Wales the Cymry occupied Gwent and Morganwg, and the Goidels Dyfed. West Wales were then largely peopled by the Goidels. The action of Cunedda and his sons changed the condition of the population of North Wales, giving the Brythons the supremacy. Thus it appears that before the Anglo-Saxons, wars and conquest existed in Wales between different races and branches of the same race. There was a succession of conquests—Goidels over Iberians and Brythons over Goidels. The result shows that no nation or race can be justified on the basis of history. Time usually has thrown a veil over the dark deeds of nations and races, but they were done notwithstanding.

In looking back over the six centuries which intervene between the present and the Norman conquest of Wales, the historian cannot fail to perceive that the conquest was inevitable. It was impossible that two warlike, independent states should continue to exist side by side without any natural boundary in perpetuity. The struggle had gone on for centuries to the great injury of both peoples, in which the Britons exhibited great skill and greater bravery. The fates were against them; and after the military power of the two Llewelyns in the thirteenth century was exhausted, the Welsh people succumbed to their masters. The divisions among the Britons which broke out periodically rendered them much feebler and unable to contend successfully against their more united foes. The existence of numerous minor states without any strong bond of organic unity was one cause of weakness and failure. The Celts over the world, once the vanguard of the Aryan nations of Europe, have become the subjects of more powerful peoples, partly because of their divisions. The Saxons and the Normans had also their divisions, but not to the same extent. If the Normans had been free from their continental wars and their royal quarrels, the conquest would have been effected earlier.

The conquest was inevitable. Was it advantageous to Wales? On this point differences of opinion may exist. The patriotic Welshman in olden and in modern times has deplored the conquest as a national calamity which has arrested the development of the people. The one-sided Englishman may think that the result was generally beneficial. The impartial historian contemplates the conquest as of a mixed nature. It ought to have been beneficial to the Welsh and the English by removing a cause of incessant war, and giving unity, strength, and peace to Wales. If the English Government had ruled Wales on the basis of justice and reason, the conquest would have been advantageous even to Wales. Justice, however, was conspicuously absent in the government of Wales by the English in past times. The aim of the Norman kings was to extinguish Welsh nationality, language, and the Welsh Church, and to constitute one homogeneous

English nation. After six hundred years of English rule the nationality and the language survive. The ancient independent Welsh Church was destroyed or absorbed in the Anglican Church. The native clergy, especially the bishops, were largely superseded by foreigners, who knew not the Welsh language and had no sympathy with the people. The consequence was that Christianity in ancient times lost its power over the Welsh people, and ignorance and indifference prevailed among a race essentially emotional and religious. In comparatively modern times the religious spirit of the Welsh people has been awakened mainly through the free activity of popular evangelists and Nonconformists, and Wales has become in the nineteenth century a nation of Nonconformists. It is only in recent years that Wales has received due attention from the English Government and is now beginning to receive important benefits from the union after the lapse of several centuries. Modern statesmen of all parties are now convinced that the proper method of governing a country of mixed nationalities is not to extinguish ancient inheritances, but to develop the resources of the people on the lines of national peculiarities. The re-creation of separate governments for ancient nationalities in a country like ours is impracticable and undesirable, and would be mischievous to all concerned. The united government must be carried on on the basis of justice to all and with the aim to develop the resources of all.

Having conquered the Welsh people, Edward proceeded to arrange for the future government of the country on the basis of the English system. He had previously—in 1281–2—sent commissioners through the principal places of North Wales, who were ordered to make a return of the customs, the laws, and legal proceedings of the country. On the basis of this report the arrangements were made called the Statute or Ordinance of Rhuddlan. He took up his residence at Rhuddlan Castle, from which he issued his proclamations to the Welsh people, promising to receive them under his protection and giving them assurance that they should enjoy their estates, their properties, and their liberties ; and that they should hold them under the same tenures as under their native princes. The provisions for the future government of the country were embodied in the historical document already mentioned—the Ordinance of Rhuddlan. The document begins in the usual royal style : " Edward, by the grace of God, King of England, Lord of Ireland, and Duke of Aquitaine, to all his subjects of his land of Snowdon, and of other his lands in Wales, greeting in the Lord." Then the document proceeds to state that the unerring Divine Providence had transferred under his dominion the land of Wales and its inhabitants. Of course, when kings and princes have been successful in war, the result has been ascribed to the Providence of God under the implied principle of fatalism that what *is* must be right. Then the document states that the customs and laws of the country were rehearsed before the king in the report referred to ; the king declares that

some of them would be abolished, others modified, the rest confirmed, and others added to them.

The ordinance provided that the justice of Snowdon is to have the custody of the king's peace in Snowdon and the lands of Wales adjoining, and that he was to administer according to the original writs of the king and the laws and customs underwritten. The ordinance makes Anglesey, Caernarvon, Meirioneth, Flint, Caermarthen, and Cardigan counties after the English fashion, and each was to have a sheriff, coroners, and bailiffs. The ordinance prescribes how the duties of the sheriff should be discharged and the manner of holding the courts should be observed. According to the old Welsh law, women could not be endowed, but this was altered. The succession to property was changed in one respect. Under the Welsh ancient law property was divided equally among the male heirs, including even bastards: this was the law called gavel-kind. By this ordinance the law of division was allowed to remain, but bastards were excluded, and women were included in the event of the failure of a male heir. The ordinance concludes by providing that disputes as to real property should be tried and decided by good and lawful men of the neighbourhood chosen by the consent of the parties.

This ordinance or statute applied to that portion of Wales over which the last Llewelyn exercised jurisdiction, namely, the districts mentioned above. It did not apply to the "Marches," or those districts on the borders of Wales and some within, which were ruled by separate lords called lords marchers. English law, with exceptions mentioned, was introduced and administered. The general effect of this ordinance was that Wales became incorporated into England, and English law, with exceptions and modifications, became operative, though the change was effected only gradually. The old Welsh division called the cwmwd—two or three of which made up a cantrev, or a hundred—had survived and was regarded by Norman-English lawyers as nearly the same as the English manor, and was defined by them as "a great seigniory," and English rules of law were applied to the administration of this division (Blue Book, 1896).

The lordships Marches were left unchanged by the Ordinance of Rhuddlan. These districts were originally won from the Welsh by Norman or Norman-English nobles under the sanction and authority of the king, and they were held and governed by these nobles in subordination to the English king. These districts, as the word *marches* denotes, were mostly on the boundaries of Wales, but some of them were districts within the Welsh borders and in the possession of Welsh nobles or princes who had submitted to the king and held and governed the territory under him. The laws administered in these marches were mostly English, but there was a semi-independence maintained by the lords marchers. They had royal rights, *jura regalia*, and their own courts and officers. The writs ran in the name of the lord, and the king's writ did not run therein. The lord marcher had power over life and

limb of criminals and could pardon offences. He could constitute boroughs and appoint officers. These marches were places of great disorder. Neither life nor property was safe, and for long periods before and after the conquest they were sources of great trouble and wrong to the Welsh people. They continued, however, until the time of Henry VIII.

The Statute or Ordinance of Rhuddlan was signed and sealed by Edward I. "on Sunday in Mid-Lent in the twelfth year of our reign." This was in the year 1284.

The Welsh were conquered and the country was annexed to England and placed under English law; but the people could not willingly entertain the idea of being governed by a foreigner living out of the country and governing by deputies not to be trusted. The severity of English officers in Wales increased Welsh repugnance to English administration. The Welsh stated that they were willing to be governed, even under England, by a prince of their own country, or even by the king himself in person; but they would not obey any ruler who was not a native of Wales or one who did not reside there. Their great repugnance was to be governed by officers, deputies of the king, whose conduct could not be depended upon. In these circumstances Edward arranged that his queen, Eleanor, who was then with child, should be confined in Wales, and the child be born a Welshman. Hence, on the 25th of April, A.D. 1284, the child was born at Caernarvon Castle, and his name was Edward, who afterwards became the king, Edward Plantagenet II., owing to the death of his elder brother, Alphonso. He became known as Edward of Caernarvon on account of his being born at that place. In the year 1301 he was formally made the prince of Wales and earl of Chester; and ever afterwards the eldest son of the English king who was heir to the throne became prince of Wales. It has sometimes been represented that the prince was announced to the Welsh as prince of Wales when he was born, but this is an error. The appointment of Edward in 1301 as prince of Wales is said to have "pleased the Welsh much, because he was born in Wales."

There is recorded in the old book, "The History of Wales," by Humphrey Llwyd, in the edition of A.D. 1584, edited by Powell, on pages 376-377, the following story: In order to please the Welsh, who desired a native as their ruler, King Edward despatched orders to his queen, Eleanor, to come at once into Wales, to Caernarvon, when she gave birth to a son on the 25th of April, 1284. Edward summoned the Welsh chiefs into his council at Rhuddlan to consider public concerns. Having received intelligence through Sir Gruffydd Llwyd that Eleanor was delivered of a son, he summoned the attendance of the Welsh chiefs, "declaring unto them, that whereas they were oftentimes suitors unto him to appoint them a prince, he, now having occasion to depart out of the country, would name them a prince, if they would allow and obey him whom he should name. To the which motion they answered that they would do so if he would appoint one of their own nation to

be their prince. Whereunto the king replied that he would name one that was born in Wales and could speak never a word of English, whose life and conversation no man was able to stain. And when they all had granted that such a one they would obey, he named his own son, Edward, born in Caernarvon Castle a few days before."

This narrative is given only in the work of Humphrey Llwyd among old writers, and has been copied from him by later writers. In the opinion of modern critics there is no genuine evidence for the story. It is probably a mythical explanation of the historical fact that Edward's son was born in Caernarvon Castle, and was subsequently designated the prince of Wales with the view of pleasing the Welsh people and imposing on them the fiction that he was a native prince.

King Edward having made progress in the pacification of the country, he ordered for the gratification of his Welsh subjects a tournament at Nevyn, in Caernarvonshire, a species of military entertainment, called also a *Round Table*, from the old custom of the Gauls and the ancient Britons, the knights engaged seating themselves around the table. So tradition has reported and ascribed the institution in Britain to the renowned King Arthur. Probably by this spectacle associated with the name of the great British hero Edward aimed at the conciliation and pacification of the Welsh people.

Having for the time being completed his work, Edward left North Wales, proceeding to Chester ; then he made a tour through Cardiganshire ; in November, 1284, he and his queen arrived at St. David's, presenting themselves as pilgrims before the shrine. They stayed in South Wales over a month, settling the affairs of the country ; and then he proceeded to Glamorgan on a visit to the earl of Gloucester, and to Bristol where he spent the Christmas holidays. When at Bristol he held a special parliament and issued a writ on the 2nd of January, 1285, by which Rhuddlan, Conway, Caernarvon and some other towns were exempted from talliages, or tolls, on internal traffic. Then the king proceeded to London after an absence of three years, where he was joyfully and triumphantly received.

King Edward, having tried to conciliate the Welsh in the way described, had to compensate some of his English noblemen for the services rendered to his cause. The lordship of Denbigh was conferred on Henry Lacy, the earl of Lincoln ; Reginald, second son of John, Lord Grey of Wilton, received the lordship of Ruthin. There were other gifts for service—all at the expense of the Welsh.

The archbishop of Canterbury visited Wales at this time for the purpose of making such ecclesiastical arrangements as accorded with the altered condition of the country. The incorporation of the Welsh into the Anglican Church was effected gradually, as shown on preceding pages. It proceeded mostly contemporaneously with the civil conquests ; and now that the conquest of

the whole country was effected by Edward I., the entire subjugation of the Welsh Church followed. Henceforth the Welsh and English Churches were united, the one absorbed by the other. King Edward desired to make Rhuddlan—his military headquarters—the see of one of the Welsh bishoprics in the place of St. Asaph, a less important place. The change was, however, forbidden by the pope, and the bishopric of St. Asaph has continued to the present time. The archbishop, during his stay at Bangor, instituted an inquiry into the losses sustained by the churches and religious houses, and in a letter to King Edward urged the full restitution of all losses to the clergy. Some compensation was rendered.

Edward, though satisfied that he had pacified the Welsh people and consolidated his conquest, made provision for holding the country against possible opposition. The castle of Caernarvon had been already built in the year 1282, and it was subsequently strengthened. The strong fortress at Conway, or Aberconway, was erected on the site of the monastery, or, rather, the monastery was converted into a fortress. The White Monks who occupied the monastery were removed to the abbey at Maenan, near Llanrwst, and afterwards to Vale Royal. Other strongholds were constructed in the midst of Gwynedd with the view of maintaining the sovereignty which he had gained. It has been handed down by certain historians, including Powell and Warrington, that Edward I. issued an order that all the bards of Wales should be hanged by martial law. He also is said to have burned the Welsh MSS. in the Tower of London. Mr. Thomas Stephens, in his noted book, "The Literature of the Kymry," has shown that these statements are untrue (see pages 327–330).

When Edward retired from Wales in 1284–5, he thought he left the country pacified and the Welsh people fairly satisfied. This, however, was not the case. The king in his proclamation promised the Welsh people the enjoyment of their estates, their property, and their liberties. This was only partially fulfilled. The rents or taxes formerly paid to the British princes were reduced. The Welsh princes, however, were deprived of their estates, which were given to English lords.

After Edward had completed the conquest of Wales and had returned to London, he prepared in 1286 to leave England to look after his provinces in France, where he remained for more than three years. During his absence he made the earl of Cornwall regent of the kingdom. The Welsh people and princes were not entirely pacified, and the harsh treatment of the English officials led to the outbreak of war. The Welsh prince, Rhys ab Meredydd, had rendered service to King Edward in the late wars, and he expected great rewards. He was, however, disappointed. The officers of the king in South Wales cited him and other Welsh noblemen into the county courts. The officers were the justiciary of South Wales and the other the king's steward in Wales. Displeased by this summons as derogatory to his dignity as the

descendant of ancient princes entitled to many privileges, he refused obedience to the order, and disturbances broke out in the execution of the summons. The king, who was then in France, having heard of Rhys's discontent, wrote to dissuade him from hostilities, and promising him on his return to redress his grievances. Rhys, however, commenced a war and succeeded in raising a number of Welshmen in South Wales to rally around him. This was in June, A.D. 1287. He commenced operations at once, and soon captured the castles of Llandovery, Dinevwr, and others. By the end of the month he had burnt the towns of Swansea, Caermarthen, and Llanbadarn Vawr. The insurrection was hasty, unjustifiable, and proceeded mainly from the disappointed ambition of Rhys himself.

The regent, the earl of Cornwall, on the 14th of June summoned the military vassals to attend at the city of Gloucester within three weeks to place themselves under his orders to march against the insurgents. He issued also orders from Gloucester to some who owed service to the king to meet him immediately at Llanbadarn Vawr. From Hereford a week later he summoned his own vassals to assemble at Monmouth on the 28th of July. Thus several divisions of royal troops were to collect at different places. The regent appointed the earl of Gloucester, Gilbert de Clare, captain over a portion of the army. The army soon advanced into South Wales. The castle belonging to Rhys, or the one he then occupied along with his wife, was besieged and soon carried by the operation of undermining—then a common method of attack. In this attack, however, Lord Stafford and others lost their lives by the fall of earth. In a short time Newcastle Emlyn and the other strongholds were recovered, and Rhys escaped with a few attendants. Most of his followers submitted. Rhys, however, was not conquered. He turned up again and retook Newcastle Emlyn and made the governor, Roger Mortimer, a prisoner. He continued the contest through the winter 1287–8. In the spring, about the end of March, the English troops attacked the castle and the garrison surrendered. Other places followed. Rhys, being defeated, fled to Ireland, having been proclaimed a traitor. In the year 1292 he returned to Wales and recommenced hostilities, but after a battle in which four thousand Welsh were said to be slain, he was captured. He was conveyed to York and tried on the charge of high treason, and executed in the year 1292.

In the year 1294 there began three insurrections in different parts of Wales arising mainly from the taxes imposed upon the country to enable Edward to carry on his wars in France. The justiciaries of Chester and North Wales—Reginald de Grey and Robert de Staundon—acting under the order of the king, ordered Roger de Pulesdon to collect the sum assigned to the Welsh. Madoc ab Morgan, supposed to have descended from the last Llewelyn—according to some persons his illegitimate son—placed himself at the head of a body of men and carried everything before him for a time. Roger de Pulesdon and the English tax

officers were captured and hanged and Caernarvon was burnt. In South Wales Maelgwyn Vychan headed a band of men who devastated Cardiganshire, Caermarthenshire, and Pembrokeshire. In another part of South Wales—Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire—another leader of insurrection arose whose name was Morgan, the son of the former lord of Caerleon. He was so powerful that he drove even the earl of Gloucester from the country and took possession of his ancestral lands.

When King Edward heard of the serious state of matters in Wales, he ordered his brother Edmund, who was then at Portsmouth preparing to embark for France, to proceed at once against Madoc. The order of the king was promptly carried out, and the forces of both sides met near Denbigh. The result of the battle that ensued was the defeat of the English with great loss on the 11th of November, A.D. 1294. The earl of Lincoln, who was also lord of Denbigh, hastening to protect one of his castles, shared in the same disaster. The king, who had returned from France, having collected an army, advanced to North Wales. With a part of his forces he occupied Conway Castle, but the greater part of his army were unable to cross the Conway owing to some very high tides. The Welsh, perceiving his condition, besieged him in the castle and cut off all his convoys of provisions. The losses of men were great—over a thousand—not merely from war, but from the weather and want of proper food. The Welsh also suffered to a similar extent. After a while the main army crossed the river, the tides having subsided, and Edward, thus strengthened, attacked the Welsh and drove them to the mountains of Snowdon. The noted Welsh chief, Cynan, was captured, was sent to Hereford, and after the manner of the times was executed as a traitor along with two others. Anglesey was reduced and the castle was begun or planned at Beaumaris, a word derived from Beau-Marish. Under the command of the earl of Warwick, a body of Welshmen who were concealed in a valley surrounded by woods were attacked by mounted horsemen and crossbowmen and were entirely defeated. Edward spent his Christmas at Conway Castle. Having opened the country by the construction of roads through the woody district and made other prudent arrangements, Edward returned to England in the early part of 1295. The opinion that the rebels were entirely subdued was, however, erroneous. Madoc, though defeated and driven out of sight, turned up again after the departure of the king and attacked the town of Oswestry and captured it. He defeated also Lord Strange and another body of English. Then he advanced in the direction of Shrewsbury. The district which he had now invaded belonged to the lord marchers. These men now sent a strong force against Madoc on his way to Shrewsbury, and he was defeated and his forces routed, and he himself taken a prisoner on "the hills of Cefn Digoll, not far from Caurs Castle." This was in the month of August, 1295. Madoc was sent a prisoner to the Tower of London. Another account is given by some writers,

according to which Madoc submitted to the king and was pardoned. The most eminent of the Welsh nobles were imprisoned for several years in different English castles, where they were retained during the war of Edward in Scotland.

The insurrection in South Wales was soon brought to an end. Maelgwyn Vychan was taken prisoner and executed at Hereford. Morgan of Glamorgan was compelled by the earl of Warwick to surrender with seven hundred of his followers and accept the mercy of the king. The Welsh nobles were disgusted with the arbitrary conduct of the earl of Gloucester and would not submit to him, but they were willing to submit to the king if they were allowed to hold their estates direct from the crown. This was conceded, and the rebellion came to an end.

Henceforth the Welsh people and princes submitted to the government of the English king. Their spirit of independence and their love of freedom gradually declined. Their native princes were nearly extinct—fallen in war or perished in prison or at the hands of the executioner. Their valour could not withstand the disciplined skill and organisation of the English armies. Their own divisions and tribal jealousies added to their weakness and clearly indicated that they could not ultimately prevail against the united organised power of England. What insurrections did occur afterwards were, with one exception, local, caused by the arbitrary and tyrannical conduct of the English officials and by the marauding expeditions into Wales from the neighbouring Marches. Welshmen henceforth were found in the English armies fighting for the English king in Scotland and in France, and were amongst the most loyal and courageous of the king's soldiers. There were, however, some insurrections. In the year 1316 a revolt broke out in South Wales under the leadership of Llewelyn ab Rhys, called by his followers Llewelyn Bren, or Brenin—the king. This was caused by the conduct of the official whom King Edward II. had appointed over the estate of the young earl of Gloucester in South Wales, whose father, Gilbert de Clare, was slain at the battle of Bannockburn in Scotland. This official superseded many of the officers who were engaged on the estate of the earl, and among them was Llewelyn ab Rhys. Receiving no redress, but a repulse from the king, to whom he appealed, he began the revolt. He attacked the castle of Caerphilly and captured it and made the governor a prisoner. The renown gained induced many Welshmen to rally to his standard, and his army soon became large—estimated at ten thousand, but no doubt much exaggerated. This army, making the mountains and caverns their headquarters, spread terror through Glamorganshire and raided the lands of the earl of Gloucester. He was, however, defeated by the troops sent against him, and he unconditionally surrendered and was sent a prisoner to the Tower, but released in the following year. In a year or two after his release he was seized by the Spensers and conveyed

to Cardiff, where he was executed as a traitor. This was done without the authority of the king.

In the year 1322 another insurrection broke out in Wales—this time in North Wales. The complaints of wrongs inflicted by the justiciary, who was Sir Roger Mortimer, and who was the lord of Chirk, aroused the people and induced Gruffydd Llwyd to place himself at the head of the revolt. He raised a considerable number of men and seemed to carry all before him for a time. He captured the castles of Chirk, Mold, and others and entrenched himself in Anglesey. The English troops followed him, and he was soon defeated, and was sent a prisoner for the rest of his life to Rhuddlan Castle. Thus ended for the time the local wars against not so much the English king as his tyrannical officials. The events just described took place during the reigns of Edwards I. and II. In the year 1301 the son of Edward I., called after the place of his birth Edward of Carnarvon, was formally endowed with the title of prince of Wales and earl of Chester. This occurred in the twenty-ninth year of Edward's reign. The object of the title, as previously stated, was to conciliate the Welsh. The historian, Matthew of Westminster, states that it "pleased the Welsh much, because he was born in Wales." This historical fact seems to modify the account previously given of the conduct of Edward I. in presenting his son a few days after his birth to the Welsh chiefs. Whether the conferring of this title on Edward did much please the Welsh people of the time may be doubted. Henceforth, however, the eldest son of the English king, the heir to the throne, has to this day borne the title of prince of Wales.

Edward I. died in the year 1307, and was succeeded by his son, the prince of Wales, who became Edward II. He was then aged twenty-three. As a king he disappointed the nation, and after a reign of twenty years was murdered at Berkeley Castle, September 21, 1327. The Welsh people remained quiet during this period, but not contented under the arbitrary government of the king's officials. During this period and most of the fourteenth century, some of the most energetic of the Welsh chiefs left their native country and migrated to France and joined the French armies and took part in the wars that were then common between the French and the English.

The young prince, Edward III., at the age of fourteen, ascended the English throne and reigned until the year 1377—a period of fifty years. During this reign there was war between the English and the Scotch; and the most ferocious wars between England and France were waged, during which the victories of Crecy and Poitiers were gained by the English. The prince of Wales, known as the Black Prince, the son of Edward III., was the hero of the age, but he died before his father. During the fourteenth century a great pestilence broke out on three different occasions and many persons died. In England there were rebellions under Jack Straw, Wat Tyler, John Ball, and others, the effect of oppression.

The great reformer John Wickliffe arose in this period, and by his sermons and writings spread those principles of Christianity which ultimately led to the Reformation.

After the death of the Black Prince, his son Richard was made prince of Wales, and soon after—in A.D. 1377—on the death of Edward III., became king of England as Richard II., though only eleven years of age, and was crowned July 16th in this year. The parliament elected a council to conduct the affairs of the kingdom during the minority of the king. The early portion of Richard II.'s reign was marked by the rebellion of Wat Tyler, just mentioned, in the year 1381. The men who followed him and assembled at Blackheath were about one hundred thousand. They advanced to Mile End. The king, though only fifteen or sixteen years of age, went out to meet them and inquire what were their demands. The reply was—a general pardon, the abolition of slavery, freedom of trade from tolls and imposts, a fixed rent on land instead of the services done by villainage. These reasonable demands were for the moment agreed to and granted by charter. The rebels, however, or some of them, continued to advance, broke into the Tower, murdered the archbishop of Canterbury and others, and invaded the city and occupied Smithfield. Finally the king, at the head of forty thousand men, advanced against and defeated them. Many were killed and the leaders executed. The charters and promises made were abolished by parliament, and the movement came to nothing. The demands were reasonable, and the leaders were probably just and good men, but a mob is not generally wise or moderate, and a good cause is often spoiled by excesses. The rest of the reign of Richard was troublous, and finally he was deposed nominally by parliament but really by the duke of Lancaster, who became king as Henry IV. in the year 1399. The poor king, Richard II., was ultimately murdered. During the stirring events of the latter half of the fourteenth century in England, Wales remained quiet but not contented. The promises of Edward I. that the customs and rights of Wales should be respected were violated by the officials appointed by the English kings to administer the affairs of the country. The possibly good intentions of the English monarchs towards Wales were frustrated by the arbitrary conduct of the actual governors, who were allowed to do much as they pleased. It is probable that if the promises made by the king had been fully and fairly fulfilled by the officials appointed, the Welsh people, though brave and lovers of independence and freedom, would have entirely and cordially submitted to the government of England. The irritating policy of these officials produced chronic discontent, and this led to the last insurrection in Wales against the English domination. This is known in history as the rebellion of Owain, or Owen Glyndwr, or Glendower, which began in the year 1400.

The author of this rebellion was Owain ab Gruffydd Vychan. He was born at Trefgarn, in Pembrokeshire, probably in the year 1359, but there were different accounts of his nativity. He was a

man of importance, having descended through his mother from the last Llewelyn, prince of Wales. His mother's name was Ellen, a lineal descendant from Catharine, daughter and heiress of Llewelyn. He "united in himself the blood of the royal families of Gwynedd, Dyved, and Powys, and was directly descended from the lords of Powys." He was sent to London as a young man to study, and he became a barrister. He abandoned the profession of law when he was admitted into the military service of Richard II. as scutiger or esquire, or shield-bearer to the king. He subsequently was employed in the military service of the king in France and Ireland and elsewhere. He was present at Flint Castle when Richard II. was made prisoner. Owain was in favour with Richard II., but under his successor, Henry IV., the duke of Lancaster, Owain became the object of suspicion and persecution, and he got into trouble. The name by which he is known in history was derived from one of his lordships in Wales, namely, Glyndyvrdwy, or Glyndwrdu, and contracted into Glyndwr and in English into Glendower.

The commencement of his rebellion was the great injustice which he suffered at the hands of his opponent and neighbour, Lord Grey de Ruthyn. A dispute arose between them respecting a piece of common land lying between their estates, or lordships. Owain endeavoured for a time to settle the dispute by legal means, and even appealed to parliament. The bishop of St. Asaph intervened to persuade the English nobles to use moderate means in dealing with a man of such great influence as Owain had, lest the Welsh people should be driven into rebellion. His appeal to the courts and to parliament was rejected contemptuously, and the appeal of the bishop to the nobles had this response : "They were not afraid of those barefooted scrubs." Other acts of injustice were done to him, and false accusations made against him, and finally he was proclaimed a traitor. His lands and possessions were seized by Reginald, Lord Grey de Ruthyn, under the sanction and encouragement of the king. Such were the acts of injustice and tyranny common in those days, and sanctioned by nobles and kings, and go far to explain the insurrections and "rebellions" which broke out from time to time. Under the influence of such deeds, Owain Glyndwr lost patience and prudence, and began that movement which is known in history as the rebellion of Owain Glyndwr. The first step which he took was to seize his own lands and much of Lord Grey's as well. This was the first stage in the rebellion. Lords Grey and Talbot hurried to capture Owain, and nearly succeeded in doing so ; he escaped during the darkness of the night.

This beginning of the war was in the autumn of the year 1400. Owain had himself proclaimed prince of Wales, and appealed to the Welsh people to come to his aid. A large number of Welshmen rallied to his cause and formed an army of considerable strength. It is said that they were influenced, as in former times, by the prophecies of Merlin. The bards applied themselves to the

study of this ancient prophet and bard, whose ambiguous language could be made to suit the circumstances of any age or hero who promised national deliverance. They announced that the time of emancipation had come, that the heir of the prophecy had appeared, and that the ancient kingdom of Brutus would soon be restored. The people, thus fired with the national patriotic spirit, joined the army of Owain in large numbers. We must not suppose that the injustice inflicted on Owain Glyndwr was the sole cause of the popular rising. His grievances were types of those inflicted on the Welsh people generally, not directly by the king but by his noble officials placed over the various Welsh districts. The aim of these officials generally was personal aggrandisement—the abuse of the trust imposed upon them. The people were oppressed and robbed in every possible way. It is not, therefore, to be wondered that the people suffering common wrongs and excited by a common national spirit should have joined the standard of Glyndwr. One of the common blunders of conquerors, in which the English participated, is to proclaim principles of justice and generosity to the conquered, and then to entrust the application of the principles to officials, who are allowed to do just as they like. This was the case in the government of Wales by the English during the Norman period.

The first blow in active war was struck by Owain Glyndwr in making a sudden attack on the town and castle of Ruthyn, then held by the king's officials. The town was plundered and then set on fire ; the Welsh troops—then not numerous—soon retreated to the mountains. King Henry IV. advanced with a strong army into North Wales as far as Anglesey. Owain and his troops could not stand against the army of Henry but retired to the mountain of Snowdon. The winter was now drawing near, and Henry, unable to do much, retired to England. Before his return he granted all the lands of Owain to his brother John, the earl of Somerset, as forfeited by the treason of Owain. He also promised to take under his protection the Welsh who were willing to submit.

In January, 1401, Henry assembled the parliament at Chester to deal with the Welsh rebellion, where he was represented by his son, Henry of Monmouth, designated thus because he was born at Monmouth, August 9, 1388. At this parliament important and severe ordinances were passed against the Welsh. A summary of them is given by Powell in his "History of Wales" on pages 319–320, and this indicates the tyranny of the English rule. According to these ordinances the Welsh were incapable of purchasing any lands, or to be elected members for any borough or county, or to hold any civil or military office in any corporate town. In any suit at law between an Englishman and Welshman the former could be convicted only by an English judge and jury. An Englishman who married a Welshwoman was deprived of all his liberties as an English subject. No Welshman should be placed in possession of any castle, or other place of strength ; and no armour or food should be brought into Wales without a warrant

from the king or his council. No Welshman should hold the office of justice, chamberlain, sheriff, or place of trust in any part of Wales. No Welshman was allowed to bring up his children to learning or to apprentice them to any trade or occupation. Such were the arbitrary enactments directed again the Welsh people on account of the rebellion of Owain Glyndwr. The main object of these severe enactments was probably to drive from the Marches over the Welsh border the Welsh who had settled in the towns of the Marches during the preceding long period of comparative peace. This policy was foolish as well as cruel, for it drove Welshmen of various classes—scholars from the universities and labourers from the fields—into Wales, who joined the insurgents, and with the arms they brought with them strengthened greatly the army of Glyndwr.

The war was resumed in the spring of 1401. In opposition to the insurgents, Sir Henry Percy, designated Hotspur, took a leading part. He was then the justiciary of the district, including Chester—an office which was equivalent to the deputy of the king. The leading Welshmen who assisted Glyndwr included William ab Tewdwr, who held Conway Castle for Owain; and Rhys ab Tewdwr, who commanded the Welsh forces in the mountains. The extent of the region then occupied by Welshmen more or less in rebellion may be estimated by the pardons offered in the summer of 1401 to the Welsh in the counties of Caernarvon, Merioneth, Denbigh, Flint, and Anglesey; and in the lordships outside Wales of Ellesmere, Chirk, Bromfield, and Yale, of the hundred of Oswestry, and of other districts. The following were by name excepted from the pardons offered—namely, Owain Glyndwr, Rhys ab Tewdwr, and William ab Tewdwr until he had surrendered Conway castle.

Some Welshmen of eminence were opposed to Glyndwr, among them one called David Gam, so called because he had only one eye—*gam* or *cam* in Welsh signifying crooked or one-eyed. According to Powell (p. 320), he was a strong partisan of the duke of Lancaster, who was then King Henry IV. Glyndwr summoned a Welsh parliament to meet at Machynlleth, in Montgomeryshire. Among those who appeared at this parliament was Sir David Gam, who came with the intention of murdering Glyndwr. The plot was discovered, and David Gam was thrown into prison, and would have been executed, but the friends even of Glyndwr intervened and induced him to pardon the criminal, which he did on condition that he would be henceforth true and loyal to him. Powell remarks that Sir David very loudly promised, but with the reservation never to perform. Glyndwr afterwards found that Gam did what he could to induce the Welsh to oppose him. Crossing into the Marches, Glyndwr burnt the house of David Gam, but the culprit escaped and fled to England, where he supported the royal cause. The parliament of Machynlleth met at the close of the year 1402, but Gam was not released from prison until some years after. The war proceeded during 1402

with varying results. The English, under Sir Henry Percy, advanced to the region of Cader Idris and gained some important successes. The lord of Powys was on the side of the king, and Glyndwr suffered a repulse at his hands. The English army, under Sir Edmund Mortimer, met the Welsh army in Radnorshire, and a battle took place at Brynglas on the 22nd of June, 1402, which resulted in the defeat of the English. The commander, Sir Edmund Mortimer, was taken a prisoner, and 1,100 Herefordshire men were reported as left dead on the field of battle. The numbers, however, are differently given by various authors—from one hundred to eight thousand. The Welsh army carried all before it. Radnor was destroyed, and other towns and fortresses were assaulted and injured, including the abbey of Cwmhir, which was plundered. The adjoining county of Montgomery was ravaged and its towns burnt. The conflict continued in various places. Lord Grey commanded the royal troops in North Wales, but he was defeated and made prisoner, probably somewhere near Ruthyn. Henry of Monmouth, the king's brother, proceeding from Shrewsbury to the native district of Glyndwr, destroyed his residences and ravaged Glyndyvrdwy, situated in Montgomeryshire, or within the ancient county of Merioneth. This was in the year 1403, soon after Henry had been made lieutenant of the king in Wales.

There was in England much opposition to Henry IV., who, as duke of Lancaster, forced his way to the throne unlawfully, having secured the dethronement and ultimately the murder of Richard II. A league was formed between Owain Glyndwr, Mortimer, and Percy against the king, which would also favour the cause of Glyndwr in Wales. Sir E. Mortimer, who had been taken prisoner, was liberated by Owain, and so was Lord Grey. Sir E. Mortimer, who was uncle of the earl of March, who was considered the rightful heir to the throne of England if Richard II. was really dead, concerning which there was some doubt, gained over to the league Sir Henry Percy, known as Hotspur. The main object of the league was to make the earl of March king of England as the lawful successor of Richard II. and to give Wales to Owain Glyndwr. Sir E. Mortimer, however, had ambitious views respecting himself.

In the year 1403 Henry IV. appointed his eldest son, Henry of Monmouth, his lieutenant in Wales and the bordering Marches and commander of his army destined to operate against the confederates. The confederates consisted of the earl of Northumberland; his son, Henry Percy, surnamed Hotspur; the earl of Worcester, younger brother of Northumberland; Sir Edmund Mortimer, who had married one of Glyndwr's daughters; and Owain Glyndwr himself. In July, 1403, the confederate army, under the command of Harry Percy, marched in the direction of Shrewsbury in order to form a junction with the army of Glyndwr, who was then in South Wales. The earl of Northumberland himself was seized with illness at Berwick, and this was the reason

young Percy had to take the command of the forces. The confederate army consisted of twelve thousand men. The army of the king was about the same. The interest of the confederates was to delay the battle until the junction with the Welsh troops had been effected. The sagacity of Henry and of his son Monmouth and the impetuosity of Percy Hotspur hastened on the battle of Shrewsbury before Glyndwr had come up, though he was near Shrewsbury. The battle was a bloody one, fought on the 23rd of July, 1403. The confederates were defeated, and lost about a third of their men; the royalists suffered to the same extent, but gained the victory and destroyed the confederacy. Young Percy perished in the battle, it was said, by an unknown hand. The earl of Worcester was made a prisoner and executed at Shrewsbury. The earl of Northumberland was tried and punished only by a fine, which was afterwards remitted by the king.

Owain Glyndwr was said to have been close to Shrewsbury when this important battle took place; but it is now almost certain that he was far away in South Wales, and was not at the time aware of Henry's march to Shrewsbury. He soon advanced, however, into the Marches and devastated the country; but in September of this year Henry turned his attention to Owain Glyndwr and drove him into Wales. The rest of the year was devoted by the king and his troops to the repair of castles and buildings injured in the course of the war. In the year 1404 there was not much serious fighting. The king's son, Henry, in command of the English army, remained inactive at Shrewsbury or Worcester during the first half of this year; but in June Glyndwr crossed into Herefordshire and did much injury to the royal party and cause. The royal prince then advanced and drove Glyndwr over the Welsh border. Owain, however, was left for the most part in possession of the whole of Wales, within which he wandered plundering the country belonging to his enemies and those who still held out against him. In this year it is recorded that the cathedrals of St. Asaph and Bangor were burnt down during the insurrection. There is now (1900) in the Bangor Cathedral an inscription on a slab to the memory of Owen Gwynedd in these words: "The body which lies interred within this wall in a stone coffin is supposed to be the remains of Owen Gwynedd, sovereign prince of Wales. He reigned 22 years and died A.D. 1169." Both this prince and his brother Cadwalladr were buried in this cathedral church. History represents them as highly distinguished for courage, humanity, and courteous manners. The father, Gruffydd ap Cynan, the last sovereign known by the title of king of Wales, overthrew Trahaiarn ap Caradoc and ascended the throne of his ancestors A.D. 1079. He was afterwards taken by treachery and imprisoned in the castle at Chester twelve years. He escaped, recovered the entire possession of his kingdom, reigned fifty-seven years, and died in his eighty-third year. He was buried near the great altar, which with the large part of this fabric was destroyed during the insurrection of Owain Glyndwr about A.D. 1404. The present church

was erected about A.D. 1496 by Henry Dean, who was at that time bishop of the diocese," &c.

In May of this year Glyndwr issued letters patent making certain appointments from the town of Dolgelly, where he had assembled his parliament. In these documents he signed himself "Owain, by the grace of God, prince of Wales." The date was "in the fourth year of our principate." In this year also Glyndwr sent an ambassador to Charles VI. of France proposing an alliance. This was successful, and Charles promised to render military assistance to his Welsh ally against the common foe, the king of England.

The year 1405 began by Owain signing the French treaty at Llanbadarn, January 12th. Military operations began in several parts of Wales before the arrival of the French troops. The young English prince, Henry of Monmouth, with a smaller force attacked the Welsh, said to be eight thousand strong, near a place called Grosmont, in Monmouthshire, and badly defeated them, slaying about one thousand, and putting the prisoners to death. A few days later the Welsh were again defeated at Pwll-Melin, in Breconshire, and about 1,500 were slain, including Owain's brother, Tewdwr. The son of Owain Gruffydd was taken prisoner. These reverses seriously injured the cause of Glyndwr, induced some of his most important adherents to abandon him, and drove himself for a time to seek shelter among the mountains. Later on in the year 1405, in July, the French troops landed at Milford Haven to aid the cause of Glyndwr to the number of twelve thousand. They advanced to Haverfordwest and burnt the town, but the castle was occupied by a garrison of the English troops under the command of the earl of Arundel. The garrison held the castle, and the French abandoned the attempt to capture it and left the neighbourhood. Owain Glyndwr, at the head of ten thousand men, joined the French army either at Tenby or Caermarthen—there are different accounts. The united army was thus strong, and they attacked and captured the important town of Caermarthen. In their march through the country towards the English border they did much injury to the inhabitants. Under these circumstances the English king exerted himself to raise all the forces he could to meet the danger impending. The two opposing armies came into collision in the month of September in Herefordshire. No serious battle was fought. Probably both sides were afraid to risk a general engagement. There were frequent skirmishes which resulted in the loss of many men. The French troops became disheartened by their losses and by the failure of their supplies, and, perhaps apprehensive of some disaster, they retreated towards their ships. When they arrived at Milford Haven they found that the English fleet from the Cinque Ports had destroyed fifteen of their ships and that their supplies and reinforcements from France had been cut off. The French at once embarked and returned to France, without having done any real service to Glyndwr, and left the Welsh to themselves.

The son of the king, Henry of Monmouth, at this time was

besieging the castle of Aberystwith, and in October he was joined by the king. The joint forces soon captured the place. Owain Glyndwr, though abandoned by the French and discouraged by recent reverses, was still active, and he soon recovered the castle. The king and his son, having suffered many losses of men and some fifty of his baggage waggons, and as winter was near, thought it prudent to retire and leave the country to Owain Glyndwr. In the month of November the lord of Pembroke, Sir Francis à-Court, arranged with Owain for a truce.

In the year 1406 the French king again endeavoured to aid the Welsh prince by sending another army to his aid. The attempt, however, was unsuccessful. The English fleet dispersed the expedition and captured its supplies. In South Wales the prince, Henry, commanding the English forces, made continuous progress and seemed nearly everywhere triumphant. Owain Glyndwr left South Wales and made North Wales his headquarters. In the years 1407 and 1408 not much of importance was done. In 1409 Glyndwr made another effort to redeem his cause. Some of his troops, under the command of two of his leaders, invaded Shropshire, but they were defeated, and one or both were executed as traitors. The rebellion was gradually declining and had degenerated into a war of flying bands, not of armies. In 1412 Rhys ab Tewdwr and his brother were made prisoners and executed at Chester. The Welsh generally were tired of the war. Glyndwr was forsaken by most ; his wife, sons, and daughters were prisoners in the hands of the English ; but Owain did not confess that he was conquered. In the year 1415 the king sent Sir Gilbert Talbot to treat with him for the settlement of the war. Owain, however, before the close of the negotiation, died on the 20th of September. In the year 1416 the son of Glyndwr, Meredydd, completed the negotiation and submitted to the English king. Thus ended the last serious rebellion of the Welsh against the power and supremacy of England. That Owain was clever and courageous, and that he was surrounded by many brave Welshmen, must be admitted, but the movement was fated from the beginning to failure. The numbers and the resources of the Welsh were immensely inferior to those of the English. Mere bravery is not sufficient to secure ultimate victory against great odds. During this final struggle two kings occupied the English throne. Henry IV. reigned from the year 1399 to 1413, when he died, and was succeeded by his son, Henry of Monmouth, under whose reign the war was brought to an end by an arrangement, and the submission of Glyndwr's son, Meredydd. The aid rendered by the French was of little value and resulted in no great victory. If the English king had not been engaged in serious wars with France and Scotland, the revolt of Owain Glyndwr would have been suppressed much earlier.

During the remainder of the fifteenth century the Welsh were quiet and submissive generally under English government and supremacy, with the exception of local brawls and fightings in Wales and in the adjoining Marches, which were characteristic of

a turbulent age. These disturbances rendered life uncomfortable and uncertain in the districts where they occurred, but they did not threaten the permanent relations of the English and the Welsh. Henceforth the history of Wales is mainly included in the history of England. During this century that great war raged in England which nearly destroyed the barons and their power. This war was between two English parties struggling for supremacy and the possession of the throne. They were the Houses of Lancaster and York, and the war was called the Wars of the Roses, on account of the symbols used by the two parties. The partisans of the House of Lancaster selected the red rose as their symbol, and those of the House of York the white rose. By these symbols the parties and the wars were known in England and in Europe generally. The history of this great and destructive war belongs properly to the history of England. Wales to some small extent was involved in the war. For instance, the strong castle of Harlech in North Wales was held for the house of Lancaster by a garrison commanded by the Welshman Davydd ab Ieuan ab Einion. The place was besieged by the Yorkists under the Herberts and was surrendered in August, A.D. 1468. This terrible war was brought to an end by the defeat and the death of Richard III. on the field of Bosworth. It has been roughly estimated that in this civil war of the Roses twelve princes, two hundred nobles, and one hundred thousand gentry and common people perished. The union of the two Roses and the two parties was effected in the year 1486 by the marriage of Henry VII. with the princess Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV.

The historical interest of the union of the Roses to Wales was that the king Henry VII. was descended from a Welshman. The son of Meredydd ab Tewdwr, Owain, became connected with the court of Henry V. He was considered a very handsome man. After the death of Henry V., Sir Owen Tudor, descended from the ancient princes of Wales, married Catharine, the widow of the king. The result of the marriage was two sons—Edmund and Jasper. The first became the earl of Richmond and the second the earl of Pembroke. The earl of Richmond became the father of Henry VII. Thus the king was descended from a Tewdwr of Welsh blood, and he founded the Tudor dynasty which continued from 1485 to 1603, terminating by the death of Queen Elizabeth, and succeeded by the House of Stuart.

CHAPTER XXXI

WALES IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY—THE ABOLITION OF THE MARCHES—THE REFORMATION

The conquest of Wales by Edward I. at the end of the thirteenth century and the suppression of the revolt of Owain Glyndwr in the beginning of the fifteenth century did not entirely remove the causes of disturbances nor secure the complete unity of Wales and England. There remained those districts in England on the borders of Wales and some inside Wales which were in a peculiar condition and the cause of much local disturbance and evil. We refer to the Marches, designated the lords marchers. The origin and the nature of these Marches are briefly explained in the following passage from "The Annals of Chepstow Castle," by John Fitchett Marsh, which is more than a mere local history. "These lordships marchers seem to have originated in a tacit permission of the sovereign to certain of the great barons to make war on their own account against the princes of Wales and to hold whatever lands they could conquer as tenants *in capite* under the English crown and under the obligation of erecting and maintaining castles for the defence of the realm against their turbulent neighbours, but in all other respects singularly free from the jurisdiction of the king's courts. They had palatinate or more than palatine jurisdiction. They were, in fact, petty sovereigns, for they enacted and enforced their own laws; had their seneschals, chancellors, and other high officers, on the model of the royal court; occasionally made war on each other, but more frequently formed alliances for the purpose of joint expeditions against the Welsh—and not only they, but even the mesne lords or petty barons, whom they created by way of subinfeudation, exercised in some instances *jura regalia* with power of life and death" (p. 6). There were no formal grants "made by the kings of England to any to be a lord marcher in Wales, nor any liberty granted to any of them as they themselves then and long time after used and the king's writs out of his courts of Westminster did not run into Wales, Pembrokeshire excepted, which was counted part of England, and, therefore, called Little England beyond Wales, neither was there any sheriff or other officer of the king to execute any of the king's writs or precepts in Wales. And yet of necessity law and justice was to be administered for

the quiet government of the people, without which no commonwealth nor society might be preserved or governed. Therefore these lords themselves were forced of necessity to execute laws of sovereign governors on their tenants and people in these strange countries and lordships subdued by them, which the kings of England did for policy permit for a time. And to grant charters of such liberties in these cases could not conveniently be for three causes."

These Marcher lordships, carved originally out of Welsh territory, were held by some independent lords nominally under the king of England but governed absolutely by themselves. In those regions the people were turbulent, and liberty, property, and even life were insecure. Incursions into adjoining territory, mostly into Wales, were frequent, and much property was taken and many lives lost. In these Marches many Welshmen resided from the time of the original conquest and many migrated there from Wales. They were mixed with Saxons and Normans or Norman-English and suffered much oppression. This state of things continued long after the conquest of Wales by Edward I. and rendered the settlement then made unproductive of the good anticipated on both sides. By the accession to the throne of England of Henry VII., descended from a Welshman, the prospects of Wales were brightened and more advantages were derived from the union. There remained, however, the Marcher lordships, the cause of much evil to Wales and a weakness to England.

Under the Tudor dynasty the question of the abolition of these lordships became urgent in order to remove a source of great evil and to secure complete unity in the legislation and the administration of the kingdom. This great change was effected under the reign of Henry VIII. The power of the lords marchers had declined as the consequence of the Wars of the Roses during which many of the English barons perished and many of the lordships came into the hands of the king. The time had thus come when these lordships should cease and be absorbed into England or Wales so that the entire country should become homogeneous in laws and administrations. This was the great benefit which Henry VIII. conferred on England and Wales in the latter part of his reign.

The statute giving effect to the changes in Wales and in the Marches bears the date of 1536 and the twenty-seventh year of the king's reign. The statute embraced two things—the abolition in Wales of the differences in laws, customs, and language between Wales and England with the object of securing unity between the two countries. After a preliminary statement of the differences and their evils the statute enacted that Wales shall be incorporated with England, the inhabitants to have the same liberties as those living in England, and that the laws of inheritance in operation in England and other English laws shall be extended to Wales. The statute aimed at an absolute uniformity between Wales and England, including even language. It was declared that in the courts

then established in Wales the English language alone should be used. The greater part of the statute was undoubtedly wise and beneficial, but the attempt to force the English language on the Welsh people was a blunder and a wrong and utterly failed. The practice of conducting legal business through the medium of the English language then established has been continued to the present, but the speech of the people has remained the same. The attempt to suppress the ordinary speech of any people by law and force has always been a great error on the part of rulers and statesmen. Every language of mankind is interesting and a precious inheritance of the past and the most important mark of any nationality. To suppress it by force is an act of gross tyranny and almost barbarous. The evolution of language during the history of the world has been determined by its own laws. The language of man originally was probably one, and the various forms of speech have been evolved from the original roots modified by the change of circumstances and the necessities of life. The languages of Europe generally and of India certainly belong to one family, the Aryan, and have come from one stock. The Welsh and the English languages belong to this family, branches or dialects of the primitive stock. The Celtic, of which Welsh is a branch, was an earlier development than English. The Celts preceded the Teutonic race in the occupation of Europe and they had a right to live and speak their own tongue. Statesmen would act wisely in developing the different races of a country on the basis of their own nationality and language, allowing the language to follow the free course of its own evolution without any force. It may be remarked that the English language has made more progress among the Welsh people during the latter half of the nineteenth century than during any preceding period, being left to its own free development without any legal constraint. The attempt of English Governments from Edward I., Henry VIII., and others to suppress the Welsh language by law proved a failure and was an act of tyranny and a folly.

The other principal part of this statute of Henry VIII. related to the lordships marchers. It proposed that these districts should cease to possess separate government and be turned into counties or be added to existing counties. It appears that the Welsh people were so dissatisfied with the peculiar government under which they were placed and the existence of the disorderly Marches on their borders that some of them petitioned the king for the complete assimilation substantially of the government of Wales to that of England. In this respect their wishes were granted.

The number of the Marches was considerable and ultimately amounted to 140, or thereabout. Some of them were situated within the limits of Wales and the rest on the borders. Up to this time the counties of Wales were only eight, but by the legislation of Henry VIII. Wales was divided into twelve shires.

The following had previously been shires or counties, namely, in North Wales, Anglesey, Caernarvon, Flint, and Merioneth ; and in South Wales, Cardigan, Pembroke, Caermarthen, and Glamorgan. To these were now added Denbigh, Montgomery, Radnor, and Brecknock. Monmouthshire was not included in the Welsh counties. To the counties named and others the Marches were added in the following proportions. To Shropshire seven lordships were added, to Herefordshire ten lordships, to Gloucestershire all the country below Chepstow Bridge and Gloucester. To Monmouthshire were added twenty-four lordships, sixteen to Breconshire, sixteen to Radnorshire, eleven to Montgomeryshire, ten to Denbighshire, seventeen to Glamorganshire, eight to Caermarthenshire, thirteen to Pembrokeshire, four to Cardiganshire, and one to Merionethshire, making 138 altogether (see Blue Book, 1896). By this arrangement Wales was divided into counties just as they are now. Monmouthshire was and is really Welsh geographically and by population, but it was never regarded legally as a Welsh county.

The judicial arrangements for Wales were made at the same time. There were established in Wales superior courts under the designation of the king's great sessions in Wales which were to be held in each county twice a year. The justice of Chester was to have jurisdiction over the counties of Denbigh and Flint. The justices of North Wales were to have under their charge the other four counties—Anglesey, Caernarvon, Merioneth, and Montgomery. Two persons learned in the law of England were to be appointed as justices for South Wales—one for the three counties of Cardigan, Pembroke, and Caermarthen, and the other for the counties of Glamorgan, Brecon, and Radnor. These justices or judges were to have jurisdiction similar to the justices of the crown and common pleas and all matters that came within the jurisdiction of the English courts. There were also established courts of quarter sessions held by justices of the peace appointed as in England. There was also provision made for sheriff's towns and for county and hundred courts similar to those in England. This system of courts continued until the year 1830, when as the result of a commission on the subject the Welsh courts and judges and the palatine jurisdiction of the county of Chester were abolished by Act of Parliament and the English system was extended over Chester and Wales and assizes were to be held in the Welsh counties as in England. In the reign of George II. there was enacted, to remove some doubt, that in all Acts of Parliament where the words "in England" are used, Wales shall be understood to be included and that the proceedings shall be conducted in the English language. By the legislation of Henry VIII. the proceedings of the courts were to be in English alone, and no one using the Welsh tongue was eligible for any office in the courts. Thus was established the complete unity of Wales and England in judicial as well as political matters. Henceforward there is not much of importance to relate peculiar to Wales. The history of

England is substantially the history of Wales. The great movements that have affected the condition and destiny of England have been participated in by Wales.

The religious Reformation in England during the reign of Henry VIII. extended to Wales. The Church of England had absorbed the Church of Wales, and they were one Church subject to the royal supremacy and the control of parliament. What may be said of the Reformation in England applies substantially to Wales. The establishment of the Tudor dynasty in England led to a better feeling between the English and Welsh peoples, and the Reformation was followed by the appointment of several Welshmen as bishops over Welsh sees. The Norman and Norman-English kings tried to extinguish the national character of the Welsh people in Church and State. Bishops were forced on the Welsh Church who were aliens in nature, in spirit, and in language. Knowledge of the Welsh language, relation to the Welsh princes, and sympathy with the people, were esteemed disqualifications for the office of a bishop. Hence for several centuries bishops were appointed by the English crown over Welsh sees who were Englishmen, bound to the English crown by ties of gratitude and by a common hostility to the Welsh people, and who formed a sort of foreign garrison. These bishops could not speak the Welsh language and were out of harmony with the population of Wales. This state of things was modified to some extent by the Tudors, and especially during the time of the Reformation and afterwards.

The Reformation in the Welsh Church was effected without any excitement or popular commotion. The following extract from the Blue Book previously referred to explains in a few words the state of matters in Wales during this movement. "It is a curious fact that so far as appears from the sources of information which we are able to command, the Reformation produced, so far as the Welsh people were concerned, little or no popular excitement. The series of statutes, which from the legal point of view constituted the reformed Church, produced little movement of opinion in the principality among the Welsh-speaking people. The aristocratic families for the most part appear to have remained at heart, if not in outward observance, Catholic, but so far as the cultivators of the soil who formed the bulk of the population were concerned, it seems that the events of the sixteenth century passed practically unnoticed. There was no Welsh Pilgrimage of Grace, nor do the statutes for the dissolution of the lesser and greater monasteries and religious houses appear to have created any movement of an insurrectionary kind in the counties with which we are dealing. We refer to the effect of the dissolution of the monasteries upon the distribution of land in Wales. The property of these religious houses was bestowed upon laymen, many of whom were the descendants of the Norman invaders, for small sums of money which, even at that time, appear to have been hardly the market value of the lands in question. In all this,

however, so far as we can ascertain, the Welsh-speaking people took little interest. They were plunged into a deep sleep from which even the civil wars and religious turmoil of the seventeenth century were only able very partially to arouse them. The Reformation indeed produced in the course of time a considerable religious movement in the principality, even in that century. But the overt effect appears to have been not in favour of any reaction so far as the farmers and the lower orders were concerned in favour of Roman Catholicism, but in the direction of Puritanism."

The Welsh people were and are religious. Poetic and emotional and musical, their nature could never be satisfied without religion; but as the consequence of their conquest and oppression by the English Government, they seemed for some generations to have sunk down into indifference and profound ignorance. They had up to the sixteenth century no Bible in their own tongue and no efficient teaching of Christianty in a language and a manner intelligible to them. According to the testimony of competent authorities the Welsh people for a long period after their conquest were reduced to a condition of irreligion and ignorance. The activity involved in the maintenance of national independence is favourable to intellectual development of religious progress, but the loss of this independence leads to a reaction in the national life which ends in inertia, indifference, and ignorance. The Welsh people were by geographical conditions and by language cut off from the other nations of the world, and to a large extent even from England. The result of this isolation was narrowness, ignorance, and degradation to some extent. Intercourse between the different nations of the world seems necessary to progressive civilisation. It has been found in modern investigations that the tribes of mankind who are barbarians and savages were for many centuries cut off from the rest of mankind, and in their isolation sank deeper in mental and moral degradation. There is no instance to be found of a nation that has lived in communication with other nations ever descending to pure barbarism and savagery. It is when tribes have departed from the civilised world and shut themselves up in the wilderness of isolation that they have gradually become barbarians. The comparative isolation of the Welsh people during centuries, especially after the conquest, contributed to their backward movement. Their intellectual condition was much higher in the tenth and eleventh centuries than it was in the sixteenth century. The Norman invasion of Wales and their prolonged wars and ultimate victory had a very prejudicial effect in arresting the development of the Welsh nation. This accounts for the small interest which the Welsh people took in the great movement of the sixteenth century—the Reformation. Under more favourable conditions such a movement would have aroused the greatest sympathy and energy of the Welsh people, as afterwards the Puritanical and Evangelical revival did, which resulted in the vast extension of Nonconformity.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

In this chapter only a short summary of events in Welsh history can be given, as Wales, from the time of Henry VIII. has been closely united with England, and her history has been mainly included in the history of England. The chief movement of a political nature in the seventeenth century in this kingdom was the contest between the Stuart kings and the parliament, which led to the civil war and the establishment of the Commonwealth and the government of Cromwell. The movement of the parliament against the king which aroused the greatest excitement in England did not awaken the same interest in Wales. The Welsh gentry were mostly in favour of the king. The people generally were ignorant, but for the most part followed the advice and the example of their landlords. In reality they were indifferent. Cromwell himself declared that "the gentry are all for the king; the common people understand nothing and follow the gentry." This was generally the case, but there were exceptions.

Wales was a country of castles, many of which exist now only as splendid ruins. These castles were mostly erected by the Norman barons as a means of conquest over the Welsh people. During the civil war of the seventeenth century they were occupied by the partisans of Charles I. At the commencement of this war—1642–8—the castle of Pembroke was the only one in the possession of the parliament, and it was this fact that mainly brought the civil war into Wales. The great and decisive battles of the war were fought in England. These were Marston Moor, Naseby, and others; but many minor battles were fought in Wales in the siege and capture of the castles. The condition of the country in South Wales when the parliamentary forces advanced is thus described: "The country is all up or rising; the smiths have all fled, cutting their bellows before they went; impossible to get a horse shod—never saw such a country! On the whole Cromwell will have to go. Cromwell, leave having been asked of Fairfax, is, on the 1st May (1648), ordered to go, marches on the 3rd May. Let him march swiftly." This description is given in Carlyle's "Letters and Speeches of Cromwell" (iii. 346). In the meantime a battle was fought at St. Fagan's, near Cardiff, on the 8th of May. The parliamentary forces were under the command

of Colonel Horton, and the royalists under Colonel Langhorne, who had previously turned traitor to the parliament and turned over to the cause of the king. The royal army was completely defeated and Langhorne retired to Pembroke Castle.

Cromwell advanced to the scene of operation by Monmouth, and arrived at Chepstow an the 11th of May. The town of Chepstow was soon captured by him. The castle could not be captured so easily, and Cromwell could not delay his progress to Pembroke. He left Colonel Ewer in command of the forces with the order to capture the castle. The garrison was a small one and defended the place with great valour. In four weeks the castle was taken by assault but aided by a stratagem.

The neighbouring castle of Raglan was captured in the year 1646 by Fairfax. It has been represented as the work of Cromwell himself, but this is an error. Cromwell was at the time engaged elsewhere. In popular opinion through the intervening time to the present nearly every castle found in ruins has been ascribed to Cromwell. The capture of Raglan Castle was attended by one very deplorable event—the destruction of a valuable library, which contained many precious MSS., probably illustrating the history of Wales, and especially South Wales and Monmouthshire. The ancient history of Britain has been contained in old MSS. handed down from age to age by certain distinguished families, and these were probably of the same nature.

When Cromwell, in 1648, left troops under the command of Colonel Ewer to besiege and capture Chepstow Castle, he advanced towards Pembroke. He proceeded by way of Swansea and Caermarthen, and on the route he put down local disturbances and rallied his forces and supporters. He arrived at Pembroke in ten days after leaving Chepstow. The castle of Pembroke, as before stated, was the only one possessed by the parliamentary party at the beginning of the civil war, and the commander was Colonel Langhorne. In 1648 this colonel and Colonels Powell and Poyer turned from the parliamentary to the royalist party and held the strong castle for the king. This was one of the reasons why Cromwell was sent into South Wales. Cromwell gives a no flattering description of Colonel Poyer, who was the leader of the garrison, whom he mentioned as "full of brandy and Presbyterian texts of Scripture." How accurate this account of Colonel Poyer is we do not venture to say. Cromwell sat down before the castle after his arrival, but his progress was impeded by the non-arrival of his artillery. Writing on June 14, 1648, from before Pembroke, Cromwell stated that the guns and ammunition had not arrived, but some good work was done with the inferior guns possessed. An attempt was made to storm the place on June 4th, but was a failure owing to the scaling ladders being too short. A second attempt was made to carry the place by assault about fourteen days after the previous one, but this was unsuccessful, the big guns not having come by sea from Bristol owing to the want of wind. During this siege of Pembroke there were commotions in and about London, occasioned apparently by the

hopes excited among the royalists by the war in Wales and the expectation of the advance of the Scotch army in support of the king. Cromwell sent some "horse and dragoons for the north" by way of Chester to reinforce Lambert in command of the English army sent to oppose the Scotch, who were then in the occupation of Berwick and Carlisle. The troops which Cromwell despatched to the north were ordered to call at Chester and render assistance to the English forces which were there under the governor, Colonel Dukinfield. In case temporary assistance were insufficient, the troop under Captain Pennyfeather was to remain at Chester, and the rest were to proceed immediately to Leeds and to communicate with the commander at York. The forces sent from Wales were six troops.

The siege of Pembroke Castle was continued, and on July 11th the town and castle were surrendered to Cromwell. The garrison generally were treated well, but the chief officers—Major-General Langhorne, "drunken Colonel Poyer," and Colonel Powell—were tried for high treason and condemned to death. Cromwell pardoned two of them, and one was to die. Lots were taken and Poyer was executed. The Welsh war was then said to be ended. Having thus captured the strongest castle in South Wales, Cromwell hurried with some thousands of troops to the north by way of Gloucester and Warwick to join Lambert in Yorkshire, where his assistance was much needed against the Scotch army.

By the capture of the strong castle of Pembroke the Welsh war was practically ended, as Cromwell declared. It was mainly a war against castles held by royal troops, supported by the gentry but not by the general population. The other castles had been previously captured by the parliamentary troops under different commanders. The strong castle of Tenby—in Welsh, Dynbych-y-Pyscod, or the precipice of fishes—dating from the Norman Conquest, was besieged in the year 1644, and after three days' conflict surrendered to the parliamentary forces. The castle of Aberystwith was originally built by Gilbert de Strongbow in the year 1109. In the conflicts between the Normans and the Welsh it was taken and retaken and several times destroyed. It was finally rebuilt in the year 1277 by Edward I., and it was finally detroyed during the civil wars of the seventeenth century, having surrendered to the parliamentary forces during this period. The castle of Hawarden was built in the thirteenth century and suffered many changes, and was captured in the year 1645 by the parliamentary troops. Powis Castle, near Welshpool, commonly called the Red Castle, from the red sandstone of which it was constructed, dates from the thirteenth century, was captured by the parliamentary forces under Sir Thomas Middleton in the year 1644. The Rhuddlan Castle, which was the centre of many conflicts between the Norman kings and the Welsh, surrendered to the parliamentary troops under General Mytton in the year 1646, and was dismantled. Finally, the strong castle of Harlech, after which the national air of "the Men of Harlech" was named, after a long siege surrendered in the year 1647 to General Mytton,

commanding the parliamentary forces. Thus all the strong fortresses of Wales held at the beginning of the civil war by the partisans of the king surrendered one after the other to the arms of Cromwell or other commanders in the same cause. The cause of the king rested on the castles and their garrisons, not on the general support of the people, illustrating the saying of Freeman, "Wales is, as every one knows, pre-eminently the land of castles. Through those districts with which we are specially concerned, castles great or small, or the ruins or traces of such castles meet us at every step." Thus it was perfectly true that when Cromwell captured the castle of Pembroke in the year 1648 the Welsh war was ended, this being the final stroke of the entire series of successful sieges of Welsh castles.

The constitutional history of Wales during this period may be noted here. The entire incorporation of Wales with England was effected, as previously shown, under the reign of Henry VIII. The parliamentary representation of Wales was settled at the same time. It was in the year 1541 that Wales, including Monmouthshire, was enabled to return twenty-seven members to the House of Commons—a greater number than the population justified. The idea of proportionate representation, or "equal electoral districts," had not then entered into the circle of political thought. This state of the representation continued until the Reform Act of 1832. There were also some persons under the old system summoned to the House of Lords, but they were generally not Welshmen but Englishmen holding estates in Wales. By the Reform Act of 1832 Wales and Monmouth, popularly regarded as belonging to the principality, were allotted thirty-two members, and by some subsequent changes the number was raised to thirty-four, namely thirty for Wales proper and four for Monmouthshire. This measure of representation, compared with England, was in excess of the population. Whatever injustice the monarchs and government of England inflicted at different periods on the conquered and subordinate nationalities now within the kingdom—and there was much injustice and oppression—in the matter of parliamentary representation they were generous. In the last year of the nineteenth century the population of the United Kingdom is estimated to be over 41,500,000, and this, divided by the 670 seats in the House of Commons, would give to every member about 62,000 inhabitants. The members representing English constituencies on the average represent 66,000 inhabitants, some more and some less. The Scotch members represent 64,000 each; the Irish only 44,000; and outside Glamorganshire the Welsh still less. The six counties of North Wales had a population at the census of 1891 of 451,090—now probably less—and they are represented in parliament by twelve members, each thus representing only 38,000 persons. Cardiff, on the contrary, now (1900) containing about 160,000 inhabitants, has only one member. These anomalies are partly the result of the fluctuations of population, and in this age of science and equality will be ultimately removed. The figures, however, show that England in the

past has been more than just, even generous, in the treatment of the other parts of the kingdom.

In former times the franchise in Wales, as in England, was very restricted, and the electors were a great minority of the population. The representation was consequently largely in the hands of the landed gentry. The mass of the people took but little interest in the elections and in the proceedings of parliament, and they seemed content that they should be represented by members of the great county families. Members of the Herbert family, of the house of Wynnstay, and the Tredegar family had for several generations a monopoly of some of the Welsh counties and boroughs. The people generally preferred to be represented by the Welsh gentry, some of whom had descended from the ancient princes of Wales. The most religious Welsh people, especially those of the Calvinistic Methodists or Presbyterians, kept aloof from politics. They seemed to think that politics were worldly and inconsistent with the cultivation of the spiritual life. Probably they were influenced in their opinion by observing that some who took an active part in political movements were anything but good men and were open to corrupt influences. This state of things is now entirely changed, and the religious men of Wales, including members of the Calvinistic Methodist denomination and even ministers, are the most earnest and energetic political partisans. Some judicious Christian men, broad in their views and sympathies, have expressed the opinion that the change which has taken place in the nineteenth century is acting to some extent adversely to the religious life and usefulness of Christian Churches, and especially of ministers of the Free Churches. The old notion that politics are inconsistent with the Christian life has been generally and wisely abandoned, but the excessive devotion to *parly* politics arouses bad feelings, an unchristian spirit, and bigotry. The Celtic spirit often exhibits much passion in religion and politics which is unfavourable to the devout and reasonable spirit of true practical Christianity. This is the abuse, not the use, of rational politics. Religious men ought to be political in the true sense of the word, and should aim at pervading the political world or the state with the pure, righteous, and lofty spirit of Christianity ; but politics should be kept in due subordination and should never be permitted to assume the mastery over the mind and the life and become a tyrant, banishing charity, fairness, and reasonable sweetness of temper. There can be no doubt that antagonism between landlords and tenants on political grounds has been exhibited in the latter period of the nineteenth century, and injustice has been shown by the former to the latter and some evictions have taken place. The magnitude of the evil has been probably exaggerated. There have been cases of landlord injustice and tyranny. On the other hand some farmers have been such strong partisans that they made themselves personally offensive by their violent conduct and also neglected the due cultivation of the land they occupied. The hostility of the landlord or his agent excited by such conduct has been sometimes ascribed to

politics alone. The large extension of the political franchise in recent times has given to the people of Wales, including farmers, so much political power that they have been able to return to parliament a large majority of Liberals. And if they were to abstain from extremes, such as the destruction of the unity of the kingdom by the creation of autonomous states within the kingdom, they may continue to maintain a Liberal preponderance in which the Free Churchmen or Nonconformists would form the most important factor. The state of things in the latter part of the nineteenth century is very different from what it was in the beginning of the century, and both landlords and tenants, Churchmen and Nonconformists, would do well to keep this in mind. If anything will hasten on the disestablishment of the Welsh Church it will be the landlord spirit of persecution of the Nonconformist tenantry. The existence of this spirit leading to evictions even on a small scale will arouse a very angry and excited state of feeling among a people supposed to be by nature excitable. In former times the worst persecutors were not the *great* landlords, but the smaller ones—the small country gentry who too often manifested a narrow spirit and showed antagonism to everything Liberal in politics and religion. The Ballot Act has done much in Wales and in England to protect the independent voters against the intimidation of landlords and the mob. We must bear in mind that the mob in Wales as elsewhere was in former times as great a tyrant and oppressor as the bad landlords. The depressed condition of agriculture for some years, combined with religious antagonism, led to a movement for the non-payment of tithes and for some drastic measure of "tenant right." The former was largely put down by the Tithe Rent-Charge Recovery Act, 1891, which placed the payment of the tithes on the owner of the farm, who could recoup himself by adding the amount to the rent. The agitation for the disestablishment of the Welsh Church still goes on, and the claim for tenant right is unsatisfied. Some of these questions will not be decided until they are settled for England also, in which Wales will be included.

The condition of Wales at the close of the nineteenth century is vastly different from what it was in former ages, and even in the beginning of this century. The agricultural portion of the country is nearly the same, or rather worse, caused by the depression of agriculture generally. The free importation of corn has brought down the price of wheat, and its cultivation is hardly remunerative. The adoption of the free trade principle has effected an immense change in the economical condition of the country. The general industry has been vastly promoted but agriculture has been depressed. The inhabitants of the agricultural districts have been declining continuously. They have migrated to the busy centres of South Wales, to England, to the United States, and to the British colonies. Welshmen may be found nearly all over the world in company with Englishmen. It seems appointed by Providence that the inhabitants of the United Kingdom should be dispersed all over the world to establish colonies, the foundations

of mighty nations in the future. In the large towns of England, especially London, Bristol, Manchester, and Liverpool, Welshmen are very numerous. South Wales has made immense progress during the nineteenth century by the prodigious development of the coal, iron, and shipping industries. The population of South Wales has increased to a very large extent. The population of Wales, including Monmouthshire, was in 1801 under 600,000. In the year 1900 it is over 1,800,000. This increase is due to South Wales, and especially the counties of Monmouth and Glamorgan. In 1801 these counties had a population combined of only 116,447, namely 45,568 and 70,879. In the year 1900 the population of these two counties is about a million. Apart from agriculture, the prospects of South Wales are good. The magnificent scenery of the country, her mountains and valleys—containing the most ancient rocks of the world—has now long attracted the attention and excited the admiration of scientists and lovers of nature. Her inland beautiful villages, and especially her seaside resorts, have grown into towns where many thousands spend their summer holidays, brought there by railways from the dense populations of England, contributing to the prosperity of the natives. The union of Wales and England, so long fought against, is now a source of prosperty to both, showing that the interests of all nationalities must be sought not in isolation but in unity and close intercourse. The different peoples forming the British kingdom are so near to each other geographically and are so much dependent on each other that any kind of separation, legislative or executive, must be injurious to each and all. Different governments involving different laws and methods of administration would create confusion, hinder intercourse, and would really be a going backward to the provincial governments and narrowness of ancient times, and would be inconsistent with the conditions of modern times. What Wales, Ireland, Scotland, and England need is *justice* to all, and this is best secured by unity. Since the union of Wales with England there has been greater prosperity arising from greater order and more enduring peace. Such disorders as have existed have been mostly local. The riots in South Wales about the middle of the nineteenth century, which went under the designation of the Rebecca riots, were directed by farmers against an absurd system of turnpike tolls imposed by turnpike lessees, by which the farmers could scarcely drive their horses and carts in any direction without having to pay them ; felt them to be a great burden and nuisance. The name of Rebecca was assumed by the leader for the purpose of concealment. The riots were, of course, suppressed, but they led to the abolition of the grievances. The Chartist movement in 1839 was more English than Welsh. It was extended to Wales, and led to some riots, and especially the riot under John Frost, Williams, and Jones, when an armed mob attacked the military at Newport. The movement collapsed in England and Wales but led to subsequent reforms in the political constitution.

CHAPTER XXXIII

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The ancient British people, as previously shown, became Christians at a very early period—certainly in the second century. In their acceptance of Christianity they preceded the Irish and the Scotch, and long before the Anglo-Saxons. Modern Welshmen are thus the representatives of the first body of Christians who existed in what we now designate the United Kingdom. They also maintained their independence of Rome and of the Anglican Church for many centuries until conquered by the Norman-English, when their Church and State finally were absorbed into the Church and State of England. Henceforth the Welsh Church was governed from England through the medium of Canterbury. The dogmas and the ceremonies of the Roman Church prevailed more or less among the Welsh, but the independence of their Church was maintained in theory, and to some extent in practice, during the Dark Ages. The subjection of the Welsh Church to Rome and to Canterbury was, however, gradually effected.

The following extract from the Blue Book previously referred to substantially expresses the actual state of things : " The first thing to notice is the opposition between Celtic Christianity and Latin Christianity, which resulted in the triumph of the Roman organisation and the subjection of the Welsh clergy to the Roman see. Next the conflict between the Welsh bishops and the see of Canterbury, which resulted in the four Welsh dioceses becoming part of the southern English province. So far as the materials permit us to form a judgment from the time that Latin Christianity prevailed over Celtic usages, there is little to differentiate the history of the Church in Wales from the course of development in England. The parochial system was gradually introduced into the principality and into the Marches. The clergy obtained from time to time considerable grants of land from the Welsh princes and other lords. Tithe became under the same influences as in England, a definite charge upon land, and the ecclesiastical law enforced in the spiritual courts of England was applied in Wales. A considerable number of religious houses were founded and endowed throughout the Welsh counties, and we think it probable that the

foundations exercised considerable influence on the progress of Welsh agriculture. To attempt to estimate the extent to which the principles of the Christian religion obtained a real hold upon the Welsh-speaking population before the Reformation raises a question of grave difficulty, for the answer to which the data are few and uncertain. As late as the end of the seventeenth century, and perhaps even afterward, there is some slight evidence of the survival of pagan rites and ceremonies, and pagan notions and probably Bardic traditions and Bardic literature, which were maintained with considerable vitality, contributed to the survival of an ancient order of ideas, while the effect of the Norman-English gradual conquest and the loss of national independence clearly arrested the progress of the Welsh people. It is evident from the account given by Giraldus Cambrensis that even after large tracts of territory had been occupied by Norman invaders, the Cymric people displayed powers intellectual and æsthetic of no mean order when measured by the standard of Western Europe generally at the same time. But the breaking up of their older social organisation, the troublous and continual warfare that took place down to the accession of Henry VII., appear to have reduced the great bulk of the Welsh-speaking people to a condition of intellectual torpor. The older Welsh aristocracy, who had been the leaders of the people and the fosterers of their literary development, gradually disappeared or became merged in the English aristocracy. When at the end of the Wars of the Roses more peaceable times arrived, the condition of the Welsh-speaking people gradually improved, but it must be remembered it was chiefly the land-owning class, as distinguished from the cultivators of the soil, that reaped the advantage of the comparatively friendly attitude of the Tudor monarchs to the principality. It is a curious fact that so far as appears from the sources of information which we are able to command, the Reformation produced, so far as the Welsh people were concerned, little or no popular excitement. The series of statutes which, from the legal point of view, constituted the reformed Church, produced little movement of opinion in the principality among the Welsh-speaking people. The aristocratic families for the most part appear to have remained at heart, if not in outward observance, Catholic ; but so far as the cultivators of the soil, who formed the bulk of the population, were concerned, it seems that the events of the sixteenth century passed unnoticed. . . . The Reformation indeed produced in the course of time a considerable religious movement in the principality even in that century. But the overt effect appears to have been not in favour of any reaction, so far as the farmers and lower orders were concerned, in favour of Roman Catholicism, but in the direction of Puritanism" (pp. 99, 100).

It is agreed among historians that the Welsh people from the time of their conquest before and long after the Reformation were in a condition of great religious ignorance and indifference. There may be differences of opinion on the subject of the attendance of

the people at the episcopal churches. Mr. Johnes, in his work, "On the Causes of Dissent in Wales," contended "that before the rise of Methodism in Wales the churches were as little attended by the great mass of the people as now." This has been disputed among others by Archdeacon Pryce, of Bangor, who has maintained that "*outwardly* there were no signs that the Church had lost her hold over the people ; no apparent falling off in the number of worshippers : the parishioners neglected not to communicate upon the great festivals ; saints' days continued to be observed, although they had degenerated in many places into occasions of public trials of muscular strength and activity, ending oftentimes in scenes of rioting and brutal violence." There is in these different representations no essential contradiction. Mr. Johnes probably intended his account to apply to the ordinary attendance at the churches, not to the holiday seasons, when attendance at church by the multitude was combined with games and public festivities. The same remark applies largely to England during the same period. There was no large attendance at church on ordinary occasions and very little earnest worship by the multitude. There was a nominal and formal recognition of the claims of the Church on special and festival occasions, but the multitude were steeped in ignorance, indifference, and superstition.

An important event in the religious history of Wales was the translation into Welsh of the sacred Scriptures and the Church of England Prayer Book. In the year 1562 an Act of Parliament was passed in the fifth year of Elizabeth's reign providing for the translation of these books. The New Testament translation was completed in the year 1567 under the supervision of the learned William Salesbury and Richard Davies, bishop of St. David's, and Thomas Huett. The Old Testament was not rendered for twenty years later, by the instrumentality of William Morgan, bishop of St. Asaph, Dr. Powell, the Welsh historian, and others. The entire Scriptures were issued in the year A.D. 1588. This translation was revised by Dr. Parry, bishop of St. Asaph, and published in the year 1620. This revised translation has remained to the present day as the standard for the Welsh people. Like the authorised version in English, this translation has been considered by Welsh scholars as very good, especially for the age when it was made, and it is the most popular book in Wales. It has done more than anything else to lay the foundation of the active Christianity of the Welsh people. The circulation of the Bible was very limited for a long time among the Welsh people, most of whom were for ages unable to read. Its issue was under the power of the Church. It has been estimated that during the whole of the eighteenth century only 80,000 Bibles were printed under the auspices of the Church. In the nineteenth century the Bible has been largely distributed in Wales and used by all classes of the population, but not by the agency of the Church. The origination of the British and Foreign Bible Society was due largely to the demand for the book by the people of Wales and the expression of that demand by that

distinguished patriarch, the Rev. T. Charles, of Bala. Nowhere is this great society more cordially and liberally supported than in the principality.

In Wales the work of the Reformation followed its course in England. The monasteries were dissolved and the land was sold to the gentry, who were mostly descended from the Norman conquerors, for a nominal amount of money. The great mass of the people, sunk in ignorance and indifference, took very little interest in these transactions and no active part.

The Church was from the time of the conquest of the country through several centuries governed by the English Church and the secular power. The principle of an established Church without any explicit definition was applied to the government of the Welsh Church in all its practical affairs. The Normans from an early period, whenever and wherever they had the power, endeavoured to place Englishmen over the Welsh sees and over the parishes. This continued till after the Reformation. The accession to the English throne of the Tudor dynasty in the person of Henry VII. led to a modification of the practice. Several Welshmen were appointed as bishops of Welsh sees. This did not, however, continue. The Revolution, which might have been expected to have introduced a more generous and popular form of Church government, introduced the practice of appointing Englishmen as bishops of Welsh sees. And even the Hanoverian dynasty favoured the practice. The consequence was that the Welsh people, especially the gentry, were strong partisans of the Stuarts, bad as they really were. During the rebellion of Prince Charles, called "the Pretender," in the year 1745, the Welsh generally were in favour of the prince, and some of the Welsh nobility were compromised, including the Sir W. Wynn of that time. The army of the prince advanced from the north as far as Derby and the prince tried to persuade his generals to advance to London. And as an alternative he was in favour of marching into Wales to enable his partisans there to join his army. The prince's generals accepted neither proposal, but returned to the north. The English Government for many generations pursued the policy of trying to destroy the language and national character of the Welsh people, and they used the episcopate in Wales as one of the instruments for carrying out this policy. Their aim was to assimilate the Welsh people in every respect to the English. The Church in Wales, governed mainly by English bishops, became a secular instrument not for the spiritual benefit of the people, but for political purposes—the entire subjugation of the people to England and the formation of one homogeneous nation in which the Welsh should be absorbed in the English. This policy was originated by the Normans and continued by their successors even up to the nineteenth century. The following extract expresses the actual state of things: "During several centuries, bishops in Wales were essentially a hostile garrison, bound to the English crown by ties of gratitude for the past, and common hatred towards the native Welsh."

In order to make the Welsh Church a mere branch of the English Church and to enable it to accomplish the aim of the policy described subservient to the English Government, many of the bishops appointed during this period of bondage were Englishmen entirely unacquainted with the language of the people and out of sympathy with them. To attempt to suppress the national sentiment through the medium of an episcopate Hanoverian in politics and latitudinarian in theology became the constant aim and determination of the English Government. These bishops, conscious of the bitterness of feeling with which the Welsh people regarded them, and in some instances dreading personal violence, spent most of their time in England, delegating the supervision of their dioceses to their relatives, upon whom, regardless of the injustice it involved to the native clergy and of the spiritual interests of the Church, they conferred every post of honour and favour. Of these episcopal nominees it should be remembered that not one could minister in the language "understanded of the people." Thus many of the most important livings were given to men unable to preach in the language of the people.

It is not possible here to give a catalogue of the bishops or clergy thus appointed, but a few may be mentioned. In the early reign of George I. Benjamin Hoadley, born in Kent in the year 1676, was made the bishop of Bangor. He was a learned man and a broad churchman. He was a man of more liberal opinions in theology than his brethren generally; and he gave offence to orthodox English churchmen by a sermon he preached on the text, "My kingdom is not of this world," which gave rise to what has been called the "Bangorian Controversy." His opponents in convocation charged him with the attempt to undermine the Church as an establishment. Hoadley was an able man, and well qualified to be a bishop in England; but George I. made him bishop of Bangor, though ignorant of the Welsh language. His appointment exasperated the people of the Bangor diocese, and led to a popular riot. He held the office for six years, from the year 1715 to 1721, but during this period he never visited his diocese and was anxious to be translated to another diocese. According to his wishes he was translated to Hereford, and afterwards to Salisbury and Winchester, and died in the year 1761.

John Luxmore was born in the year 1756 and died in 1830. He was made bishop of St. Asaph in 1815. He held also the office of archdeacon in his own diocese at the same time. It has been estimated that Bishop Luxmore and his relations and connections, numbering twelve, were in the receipt of about £25,000 per annum in the diocese of St. Asaph from offices whose duties were only nominally discharged—a larger sum than was expended on the resident clergy of the diocese according to the estimates of Mr. Johnes.

Richard Watson was born in Westmorland, at Heversham, in the year 1737. He became a very learned man, a professor of chemistry at Cambridge in 1764, and 1771 professor of divinity,

and was a fellow of the Royal Society. He wrote several books, including his Apology for Christianity, in the year 1776, and in 1796 his Apology for the Bible in reply to Tom Paine's "Age of Reason." He was a man of great abilities. He was rewarded in 1782 by the Government by the appointment to be the bishop of Llandaff. He was allowed at the same time to hold the office of archdeacon of Ely, the professorship of divinity, and other ecclesiastical offices. According to the custom of Englishmen appointed bishops over Welsh sees he spent most of his time in England, especially on the shore of lake Windermere. He was a man of great ability but did nothing for his diocese.

Samuel Horsley was born in the year 1733 in London, where his father was a clergyman. His father was John Horsley, and was educated for the Dissenting ministry, but he conformed and became the rector of Thorley. Samuel was sent to Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He became a learned man, an astronomer, a fellow of the Royal Society. He even edited a new edition of the works of Sir Isaac Newton. Ecclesiastically he began his public life by becoming curate to his father at Newington Butts, and succeeded him in the living. In the year 1781 he became archdeacon of St. Albans, and in 1787 he was made prebend of Gloucester. In 1788 he was made bishop of St. David's, but retained the rectory of Newington. The stipends of the curates of the diocese were then only £7 per annum, and he used his power to increase them to £15. In 1793 he was translated to the see of Rochester, holding also the office of Dean of Westminster. Again in 1802 he was translated to the see of St. Asaph, which formerly was a rich bishopric. It is recorded of him that in July, 1806, he visited his diocese, implying that this was a rare occurrence. In October of this year he died at Brighton. This Englishman, though appointed to two Welsh sees, did not understand the language of the Welsh people, and usually resided in England. This practice of appointing Englishmen to Welsh sees ignorant of the Welsh language and people continued up to the middle of the nineteenth century. A notable instance of this was the appointment of the learned professor and Greek historian, Dr. Thirlwell, to the see of St. David's in 1840. There was no objection to such an appointment except on the important ground that his abundant learning did not include the language of the people among whom he was to be the chief pastor. To the credit, however, of Dr. Thirlwell it may be said that soon after his appointment he began to learn the Welsh language, and he succeeded so well that he was soon able to preach in that language.

The above instances have been given to show how the English authorities in Church and State governed the Welsh Church from the time of the Normans until the latter half of the nineteenth century. A change has been effected, and now it is agreed among all English parties that the Welsh bishops must be Welshmen able to teach in Welsh as well as English. The evil described above was not confined to the bishops, but extended to the clergy generally. The most important livings were given to Englishmen

ignorant of the language and nature of the Welsh people, many of whom were non-resident and only occasionally visited their flocks, who were ministered to by badly paid curates. The results of this state of things are not difficult to understand. The privileges and endowments of the Welsh Church were used by the Government as political machinery and not as a spiritual force. The last thing thought of was the moral and spiritual welfare of the people themselves. The people were divided into two classes. The one embraced the landowners of the aristocratic type, speaking for the most part the English language only, more in sympathy with the English gentry than with the Welsh cultivators of the land, and exhibiting the narrowness and the prejudices of their English class; the other class consisted of the great mass of the people, the farmers and the labourers and the small tradesmen, speaking habitually the Welsh language only. In some parts of Wales, such as Pembrokeshire, Flintshire, and a part of Montgomeryshire belonging to the ancient state of Powys, the people have for some generations mostly spoken English; but in the interior among the agricultural population the people spoke only Welsh until recently. During the dark ages which we have tried to describe both classes were indifferent to religion in the truest and highest sense of the word and "unconcerned with those deeper problems of a philosophical and spiritual character which have occupied so large a part in the intellectual life of Wales of recent years." The following from a sincere churchman (J. Bryce) may be accepted as a testimony to the low condition of religion during the period referred to: "Under the baneful influence of this shameless nepotism a tide of religious indifference set in. Christianity came to be regarded in its highest ideal as only a system of morality whose special claim for acceptance upon society was its conservative tendency, and upon individuals the worldly advantages that generally followed in its wake. Many of the Welsh clergy sank to the level of the country squires of those days, whose drinking excesses they excused and not rarely countenanced by actual participation. The truth that the Church is the mystical body of Christ, from whence, according to the ordinary course of gospel graces, the Mediator's gifts of holiness and knowledge proceed downward to the members, must have seemed to the earnest-minded to be contradicted by actual experience, and their faith failing them, a door was thus being opened for the belief that the essence of religion consisted solely in the relation of the individual soul to God. . . . No wonder that, taught by bitter experience, the Welsh mind should entertain almost a morbid dread of State interference in ecclesiastical matters."

Such was the state of religion in Wales during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and continued in the Anglican Church up to the nineteenth century. The Welsh mind is essentially religious, and when certain influences were brought to bear on that mind in the period indicated it rose from its darkness and torpor and devoted itself to a more personal and spiritual religion partly

within the limits of the national Church and afterwards more extensively outside of that Church. Hence arose the Nonconformity which gradually spread and has in the nineteenth century become the predominant form of Christianity. No historical account of modern Christianity in Wales can be complete without some discription of that religious movement among the people in past times which has resulted in the Free Churches of the nineteenth century ; but only a mere outline is here possible.

The Free Churches of Wales are chiefly of four denominations —the Independents, or Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Calvinistic Methodists, and the Wesleyan Methodists. The other denominations, so numerous in England, are few and small in the principality. The causes which led to Nonconformity began to operate soon after the Reformation. The more spiritual apprehension of the nature of religion and the craving after a higher type of spiritual life than was presented or fostered in the Established Church led individual men, mainly in the Church, to live and act outside the ordinary methods then recognised by the Church. The conception that religion was a matter between the individual soul and God, if not definitely formed and propounded, was implied in the action of the early Nonconformists. Indeed, this principle was implied in the essence of the Reformation itself. The great dogma propounded by Luther—justification by faith—involved it. A man is justified when by a *personal faith* he becomes united to the living Saviour. Many churchmen have, however, misconceived the truth when they identified faith with the mere belief in a creed, a mere assent of the understanding to the dogmas of the Christian religion. This may be implied, but it is not that *act* of the soul which consists in trust in the personal Saviour, in the submission of the human will to the authority of Christ, which involves the opening of the entire mind to the gospel, the reception of the Divine seed into the soul as the good soil receives the seed which produces an abundant harvest. The purely intellectual operation in reference to the gospel does not constitute that energy of the soul which is faith *in* or *on* the Saviour. This was the spirit which moved the earliest Puritans and Nonconformists. Some of them, at least, were dissatisfied with the imperfection of the Reformation in England and condemned what they regarded as the remnants of Popery in the Anglican Church. Apart, however, from mere theory, the earliest evangelists in Wales went forth in their own way to utter their own thoughts and to induce men to seek salvation in Christ alone.

The movement of the evangelists which led to Nonconformity originated in the Anglican Church, and the leaders were mostly, but not entirely, clergymen dissatisfied with the condition of the Church and anxious to benefit their countrymen who were ignorant and careless. Amongst the earliest of the evangelists who laboured to arouse the people of Wales were William Wroth, William Erbury, Walter Craddock, and others.

William Wroth was for some time pastor of the Congregational Church at Llanvaches, in Monmouthshire, having been previously a Church clergyman. He was succeeded in his pastorate by Walter Craddock, who was born in the year 1606 of a respectable family, was an Oxford man, and on his return to Wales became curate to William Erbury at Cardiff, deposed by the Bishop of Llandaff, removed to Wrexham for a time and then became an active evangelist, finally became the pastor at Llanvaches, and died at Trevecca in the year 1659. William Erbury was born in the year 1604, was sent to Oxford in 1619, took his degree in 1623. He returned to Wales and obtained the living of Cardiff. In 1638 he had to leave the Church, and became an Independent minister; in 1640 began to preach against episcopacy, and died in the year 1654. It was said that he became tainted with the Arian heresy, which was then spreading, but returned to the orthodox faith. These men were among the early evangelists, who did much to awaken in the people of Wales an interest in evangelical and spiritual religion.

There followed this group another series of men, perhaps more of the evangelistic order than their predecessors. The most noted of this series, and perhaps the most important, was Vavassor Powell. He was born in the year 1617. His father was Richard Powell, said by his enemies to have been "an Ale Keeper." His mother was Penelope, the daughter of William Vavassor, of Newtown, Montgomeryshire, from whom he obtained his name of Vavassor. Her family seems to have been of good position and possessed of property. At the age of seventeen he was sent to Jesus College, Oxford, but he took no degree. He began his public life in the capacity of a schoolmaster at Clun, near his native county of Radnorshire, and soon after he came into the possession of property which made him independent to pursue his own vocation as an evangelist. In 1638 he was converted under the ministry of Walter Craddock, and by the reading of the writings of W. Sibbs. In 1639 he began the career of an evangelist, full of Christian zeal and sympathy with his fellow-countrymen, then in a condition of ignorance and religious indifference. In 1640 he was arrested for preaching in a house in Radnorshire. After remaining a night in confinement he was released. Again he was arrested and tried, but acquitted. In 1642 he went to London, and for two years he preached in and about London, and for two years more he preached in Kent as an evangelist. This was the time of the civil war between the Parliament and the King. The Parliamentary army, after the surrender of Raglan Castle, soon became master of Wales. Vavassor Powell then returned to Wales to avail himself of the freedom secured for preaching the gospel. He began an Independent, and travelled through Wales as an evangelist, and in the course of his labours he formed twenty Congregational Churches. Hitherto he was regarded as a layman, doing much Christian work. Then he was invited to become the pastor of the

Congregational Church at Newtown, in the county of Montgomery, where his mother originally came from. He accepted the invitation, and was formally ordained as the pastor. That was the time when Parliament undertook the task of purging the Church of incompetent and immoral ministers, and placing over parishes and districts suitable men who were paid a suitable salary. The Parliament granted to Powell the salary of £100 per annum. He received the sum of £60 for eight years. In 1647 he was offered and refused the rectory of Penstrowed, a country parish near Newtown. In the year 1649 he went to London and preached before the Lord Mayor, and in the year 1650 before Parliament. During the time of his pastorate at Newtown he resided in the neighbouring parish of Kerry. He was then a man of property and independent of his ministerial salary. He was a man of independent thought and action, and he ventured to criticise the ordinances of Parliament. In 1655 he was apprehended at Aberbechan, a place on the Severn, near Newtown. He returned to London, where he died in the year 1670, and was buried, amidst many public honours, at Bunhill Fields burial-ground, then the burial-place of Nonconformists.

This brief outline of a great man who made a mark on his generation and left many good results of an active Christian life behind him, must suffice. There were, of course, many other active and zealous men, lay and clerical, at this time, whom we cannot describe. They included such men as Morgan Lloyd, Hugh and James Owen. The men hitherto described were either Churchmen or men who ceased to be such, and who became Dissenters, and from the nature of their circumstances became mostly Independents, or Congregationalists. Methodism in any sense of the term had not yet made its appearance. In the time of the Commonwealth freedom for Christian evangelisation was granted, and the earnest-minded Christians who sought the further development of the English Church on the true Protestant and evangelical basis were in the position of supremacy, but many of them endeavoured to enforce a more spiritual and puritanical form of Christianity on the nation by the power of the State, but they failed. The restoration of the Stuart monarchy in the year 1660 led again to the policy of persecution. The ejection of the 2,000 Nonconformists from the Church in the year 1662 comprehended Wales as well as England. The Act of Uniformity which led to this ejection extended to the Anglican Church in the two countries, and led to the vast increase of Nonconformists everywhere. The cause of spiritual and evangelical Christianity continued to be maintained amidst much persecution. The Revolution of 1688 brought much relief and the principle of toleration under which Nonconformity flourished side by side with the National Church. Such was the religious condition of Wales at the close of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The Dissenting Churches of the seventeenth century continued into the eighteenth century, and there were some eminent and

godly ministers over those Churches who did a good work for the religious welfare of the people. Amongst these may be mentioned Edmund Jones, the minister of the Independent Church at Pontypool, a man distinguished for his piety and usefulness ; Henry Davies, Lewis Jones, Joseph Simpson, William Williams, Owen Rees, and Philip Pugh, pastor of the Independent Church of Llwynypiod in South Wales. The last named was a very successful minister, and preached to a large congregation, which in those times was rather uncommon. He drew the people in crowds, and the secret of his success may be inferred from the advice which he gave to the Rev. Daniel Rowlands, of Llangeitho, one of the founders of Welsh Methodism, then a clergyman of the English Church. Rowlands preached "the thunders" of the law, the curses of sin, the damnation of hell, &c. The people were terrified, trembled, shouted, and cried, and were made conscious that they were on the verge of perdition, but their spiritual wants were not met and satisfied. The advice of Philip Pugh, the Dissenting minister, to the Church clergyman was, "Preach the gospel to the people, my dear sir ; apply the balm that is in Gilead to their wounded spirits, and show their need of faith in the crucified Redeemer." This advice was taken, and D. Rowlands became the preacher of the gospel as well as of the law, of the love and mercy of God in Jesus Christ as well as of sin and repentance. This change in his preaching led to greater results, and the people were not merely convicted of sin, but found what they needed—pardon, peace, salvation ; and they shouted "Glory be to God ! Praise Him for ever !" (see Williams's "Welsh Calvinistic Methodism"). This change in the matter of Daniel Rowlands' preaching and its results has a lesson for all ages. The preaching which has always succeeded among the mass of men, conscious of sin and the need of salvation, is the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ the Saviour. The preaching of repentance for sin may be a preliminary, as was that of John the Baptist, but it was of no meaning or power except it led to the "Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." The preaching of mere morality or a good life has never yet had popular power, or been able to awaken men to a higher life. The gospel of *mercy* touches the human heart and makes it internally spiritual, or good, and like the good tree will then produce good fruits. Such was the state of religion in Wales in the beginning of the eighteenth century. The Nonconformist Churches generally were not large or powerful, but there were exceptions, such as at Pontypool and Llwynypiod. About this time, 1729, began a great controversy, designated "The Great Arminian Controversy." The beginning of the movement turned on the doctrine or philosophical question of the free-will implied in the word Arminian, but this was soon lost in the higher question concerning the person of Christ. About this time Arianism began to spread in England and Wales, a revival of the "heresy" which created much disturbance in the ancient Church of the fourth century, formulated and propagated by Arius of

Alexandria. It spread in the English Church, and among the Nonconformists in England and Wales. It was directed against the doctrine of the Trinity and the Deity of Christ, and represented Christ as more than a man—the greatest creature—but not God. The final development of this dogma was Unitarianism, or as formerly called Socinianism, after Socinus, its great advocate. This system of Arianism was accepted by many theologians, but gradually declined under the revived power of Evangelical Christianity in the form of Methodism. During its prevalence in Wales and England it not only injured the State Church, but it robbed Nonconformity of its popular power and seriously arrested its progress. In many Churches religion became mainly a dogma divested of life and spiritual power. This was the case in Wales, but it could not retain its hold over the Welsh mind. There are in South Wales remnants of this movement even now in a few Unitarian congregations and in the Caermarthen College, whose trustees are still Unitarians, who appoint Unitarian professors for classics and mathematics but are by law compelled to elect an orthodox professor for theology.

The strength of Nonconformists in Wales in the early part of the eighteenth century before the dawn of Methodism has been estimated. About the year 1715 Dr. John Evans collected statistics of the Nonconformist Churches and their numbers in Wales, and these are preserved in the noted Dr. Williams's library in London. On the basis of these returns the late Rev. Dr. Rees, Congregational minister of Swansea, made a calculation which is contained in his able "History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales," as to the number of Nonconformists in Wales at that time. According to his estimates the population of Wales, including Monmouthshire, at the beginning of the eighteenth century was about 400,000, of which North Wales had 140,000, and South Wales 260,000. Dr. Rees estimated that the Nonconformists were then 50,000 men, women, and children, mainly in South Wales (47,500) and in North Wales (2,500). North Wales seemed thus behind South Wales in this respect. According to the *Blue Book* previously referred to there were only eight Nonconformist places of worship in North Wales in the year 1735. The people in the interior of the country were ignorant and religiously indifferent. The above figures are professedly only approximate estimates of population and of Nonconformists; possibly they exceed the actual numbers.

We come now to consider that great movement in the religious condition of Wales which has been called "The Methodist Revival," from which have sprung the present religious denominations. At first there was no Methodist Church or denomination. The movement was a religious revival among some members of the National Church, and there was no intention to create a sect or a denomination outside the Church. English readers must not confound the Methodists of Wales with those of England originated by John Wesley. Both began their career in the Anglican

Church, and both were gradually driven out. The former, as their name implies, were in doctrines strict Calvinists, and some in the early period showed a tendency to Antinomianism. The Calvinistic Methodists of Wales, however, have, *as a body*, never allowed their dogma of predestination to influence their practical life. Their observance of moral duties in private or in Church life has been equal to that of any other body of men, and superior to most. The Methodists of England have been in doctrines Arminians, and strongly antagonistic to predestination in every form. They, however, were not legitimately exposed to the charge sometimes made against them that they taught the doctrine of salvation by works. Both bodies were really one in the maintenance of the truth that salvation is by Divine grace through a personal faith in Jesus Christ. Mere doctrinal theories do not always determine the practical life. Men are often better or worse than their opinions.

The Methodist revival in Wales began in the year 1736, and the originator was a young man named Howell Harris. In the year 1735 this young man, who resided at Talgarth in Breconshire, was deeply impressed by what he heard in the parish church, which led to his conversion. His friends, to cure him of what they regarded as fanaticism, sent him to Oxford in November of the same year. The "fanaticism" was not cured. He retired from Oxford in 1736, and then began that movement which resulted in the formation of the Calvinistic Methodist body. He went about from house to house warning and exhorting, and he was wonderfully successful in awakening the people to a sense of sin and the need of personal salvation. The churches were crowded as the result of his labours. "Thus began that mighty preaching that roused Wales from the sleep of ages."

About the same time there began a similar movement in the county of Cardigan at the village of Llangeitho. The Anglican clergyman in the parish church of this place was then Rev. John Rowlands, son of the late vicar. His brother, Rev. Daniel Rowlands, was the curate and the officiating minister. He was allowed to take orders earlier than usual, when only twenty-one years of age, on the ground of his superior scholarship. He was now a man of mark, though only twenty-two years of age. He was ambitious to become a popular preacher. In striving to secure this he imitated the preaching of the popular Dissenting minister, Rev. Philip Pugh, of Llwynypiod, already referred to. At this time Rowlands was not a converted man. In the morning of the Sunday he laboured in the Church service, and in the afternoon he joined young men in athletic sports. He, however, soon became a converted man. The change took place under the preaching of the Rev. Griffith Jones, the clergyman of Llanddowrar, in the county of Caermarthen, when on a visit to Llandewi Brefi, five miles from Llangeitho. Henceforth Daniel Rowlands, the curate, became an earnest and successful evangelist, and one of the joint founders of the Methodist Society in Wales.

There was a third person concerned in the beginning of this movement, namely, Howell Davies. He was converted under the ministry of the same talented and Christian minister, Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowrar. This young man soon devoted himself to the Christian ministry, and he was ordained as curate of Llysfran, in Pembrokeshire. He was a minister of great power, and large numbers came to hear him; but through the influence of some parishioners he was dismissed from his curacy. After this Mr. Davies travelled about as an evangelist, and was so successful that where he went the churches were not able to hold the people who came to hear when even he administered the sacrament. It was estimated that over 2,000 communicants attended him in Pembrokeshire. Thus in three different counties in South Wales three young men were the main instruments in the origination of that great Methodist movement which gradually spread over the whole of Wales. They were all within the National Church.

Something should be here mentioned concerning the distinguished clergyman who had so much to do with the introduction of these men into public life, namely, Griffith Jones. He was an eminent clergyman of the National Church, rector of the parish of Llanddowrar, in the county of Caermarthen, previously that of Llandilo. This was from the year 1716 to his death in 1761. He was an active minister in the early part of the eighteenth century. He was not a Methodist, but preceded them, and possessed their evangelistic spirit. He was one of those devout, earnest, and energetic clergymen of whom Wales possessed a few, but only a few, at that period. He cared for the spiritual welfare of the people. He has been called "the Morning Star of the Methodist Revival," because he preceded and introduced it. By others he has been designated "the Apostle of Wales," viewing his labours in reference to the whole country. He administered the sacrament every month to large numbers of the people in his parish church; and on the preceding Saturday evening he gathered the intending communicants, whom he catechised in the truths of the gospel. In addition to his labours in his own parish, he made occasional visits to many other parts of Wales, and preached the gospel in those churches that were open to him. In every district he visited, large crowds assembled to hear him, and much good was done.

Mr. Griffith Jones was much distressed by the ignorance which he found among the people. This he specially discovered by his method of catechising. In those days very few of the people could read, and only a few copies of the Scriptures were in circulation. The idea was formed in his mind to do something special to instruct the people. He promoted the publication and distribution of good books, and several editions of the Scriptures in the Welsh language. In this he was aided by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The peculiarity of his work in this direction was the formation of schools in different places to

teach the people to read, and especially to read the Scriptures. These schools came to be called "Circulating Charity Schools." A number of men were appointed as teachers, and they were sent to different places and to remain there until they had taught a number of persons—men, women, and children—to read, and then they were to remove to other places and repeat the same process. Hence the name "Circulating Schools." This work began in 1730. This simple method did much good. The number of these schools increased until the year before Mr. Jones's death, when they amounted to many in South Wales and in North Wales. These schools were in operation for twenty-four years during the lifetime of their benevolent founder, and it was estimated that by their instrumentality over 150,000 persons, from six to seventy years of age, were taught to read the Scriptures.

The three men mentioned above, Howell Harris, Daniel Rowlands, and Howell Davies, were regarded as the founders of Welsh Methodism; but others who soon came forward have been joined with them in the definite work. Among these, in the early stage of the work, was William Williams, of Pantycelyn. He was originally a medical student, and being converted under the open-air ministry of Howell Harris at Talgarth, he relinquished his medical studies and entered the ministry of the Established Church. He was ordained as a deacon in the year 1740, and became a curate in several places. He was too zealous, however, for the Church of that period. In his first curacy he was charged with no less than nineteen offences. Among these were that he did not use the sign of the cross at baptism, that he omitted some portions of the service, and that he went out and preached the gospel in the highways. When he presented himself for priest's orders to the bishop after the usual manner of bishops he was refused, and Williams, thus repulsed, joined the Methodists, and for many years became a burning and shining light amongst them. Williams was not only a great preacher and evangelist, he was also a man of poetic genius, and wrote many hymns of great beauty in Welsh and English. There are two found in most English hymnals which have always been highly valued. The one is that general favourite, "Guide me, O Thou great Jehovah," the other is "O'er those gloomy hills of darkness."

Another of these early evangelists was Peter Williams, of Llangharne, in Caermarthenshire. Whilst at Caermarthen College, against the order of his tutor he went to hear George Whitfield, who then visited the town. He was converted under the sermon. His tutor and fellow-students called him a Methodist, a designation then for an earnest Christian. He took orders in the Church, and held several curacies. His earnestness was not, however, acceptable to "the Church," and he left and joined the Methodists. The above five men have been regarded as the fathers and the founders of the Welsh Methodists. The movement was independent of the labours of Wesley and Whitfield in England, but it was of a similar nature and in accordance therewith.

Whitfield especially was in full sympathy with Howell Harris, and they met for the first time in harmonious co-operation at Cardiff in the year 1738.

The leading men of this movement were, or had been, clergymen of the Church of England, and they had no idea or intention of forsaking the Church. They were engaged in a special work for the revival of religious life among the people of Wales, and they hoped to do this within the limits of the Church. Such a movement, however, requires co-operation, and when men meet together for this purpose they make definite arrangements to secure successful operations, and these gradually assume ecclesiastical organisation, more or less definite. Such was the case with these early Welsh Methodists. They formed an association, which met for the first time in the year 1742, at Watford, in Glamorganshire. The Rev. G. Whitfield from England was invited to attend and preside over the meeting. There were present at this first association meeting Howell Harris, Daniel Rowlands, William Williams of Pantycelyn, J. Powell, and many others, preachers and exhorters. The object of this meeting was to provide some wise supervision for the numerous converts made by the powerful preaching of these early Methodists, most of whom were young men under thirty years of age. The association thus formed gradually became an established institution, and corresponded to the General Assembly in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

The first ministers in this early Methodist body were ordained clergymen of the National Church. They numbered ten in the year 1742. They alone were then recognised as duly ordained and authorised ministers in guiding and controlling the movement. In addition to them there were others among the early converts who by an inward impulse felt it their duty to preach the gospel to their ignorant and ungodly countrymen. These were not educated men, but possessed of much natural ability and great zeal. They were not regarded as ministers, but as exhorters. They acted in due subordination to the ordained ministers, and were accustomed to congregate, on the monthly Sabbath especially, at Llangeitho, where they received instruction and guidance in the parish church under the wise and powerful ministry of Daniel Rowlands.

The numerous converts at this early period needed to be bound together by some bond. They were gathered into *societies* in different parts of the country. These societies were not then called churches, as the leaders and the people professed to be members of the National Church. They contained, however, the germs of churches, and ultimately assumed the position of churches. By the year 1744 there were formed in South Wales about 140 of these societies. The regular ministers episcopally ordained were few, and they could not be placed in charge of these separate societies. The order of "exhorters" previously referred to consisted of lay preachers, and these were placed over the societies; but they were not designated ministers, nor yet

pastors, but exhorters. A number of these societies in the same geographical area were formed into a district, and an officer was placed over each district under the designation of overseer. Those who discharged the duties now attached to a deacon in a Dissenting Church were then called stewards. The representatives of the societies met together for practical business once a quarter in each district, and the meeting was called an association, not an ecclesiastical synod. This was the organised form of the movement only a few years after its origination, and was considered consistent with membership of the National Church.

There was no place of worship erected for the use of the Methodists during the first eleven years of this movement. The first building erected was at Builth, in Breconshire. They avoided calling it a chapel because the National Church had chapels ; and they declined to call it a meeting-house in imitation of Dissenters with whom they did not wish to be confounded. They pursued a medium course, and called the building "A House for Religious Purposes." They would not register their buildings or take out licences for their preachers under the Toleration Act, even to protect themselves against the persecution which they suffered from the mob and the gentry, lest they should be regarded as Dissenters for whose benefit the Act was passed. In addition to the overseers of districts there was a moderator over the other officers, and over the entire movement there was a general moderator. The moderators were chairmen of the meetings.

Such was the organised form of the Methodist Revival movement in its earliest stage. The ordained clergy and the exhorters, or lay preachers, went about from place to place preaching the gospel, and the effect of their preaching was very great. They preached the "terrors of the law," the awful evil of sin, the final penalty of an evil life, the curse of sin and God's displeasure against the sinner, the power of Satan, the awfulness of death to the unprepared soul, the torments of hell, and the misery of the damned. Their representations of these subjects were very graphic and awful. They were not, however, content with this. They preached faithfully the gospel in its strict sense, the glad tidings of salvation through Jesus Christ, the love and the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. They described the sufferings of Jesus as the substitute and the Saviour of men in a most powerful manner, largely, if not mainly, on the physical side. We may now criticise some of their modes of apprehension and representation as materialistic, extravagant, and incorrect, but the result of their preaching was to awaken in the minds of a people ignorant and dead, a consciousness of evil and of spiritual life. Under the influence of this preaching and that of the Nonconformists proper and the successors of these men the Welsh people have become the most religious of any of the United Kingdom. Daniel Rowlands, of Llangeitho, was the greatest preacher, but Howell Harris, who never prepared a sermon, was the Boanerges of the movement. "A congregation of 2,000 people have been known

to stand for upwards of two hours in a drenching rain to hear him preach." One feature in the ministry of these men, especially in that of Howell Harris, was its itinerancy. They did not confine their labours to one district. The whole of Wales was treated as one parish in the spirit expressed by John Wesley in England, "that the world was his parish." Howell Harris travelled through the counties of South Wales in his evangelistic work, and even into North Wales, then considered more ignorant and irreligious than South Wales. Everywhere he found the people "sitting in darkness and in the region and shadow of death," but his preaching was so powerful that he seldom left a village or a town without "leaving behind him the nucleus of a religious community." The mob, infuriated by drink, especially at fairs and wakes, attacked and bruised him. The clergy regarded him as a false prophet, the gentry treated him as a disturber of the peace, and the magistrates tried to disperse the assemblies by reading the Riot Act. All was in vain; Harris continued his labours with immense success. In these labours the preachers received no salaries, and in some cases had much difficulty in obtaining a livelihood. They were, however, sustained, and some of them, like Paul, laboured with their hands. A full and minute description of the labours of Harris and the other itinerant preachers, their persecutions and their successes, would be impossible here.

Howell Harris retired to Trevecca, which he made his home. There were disputes between him and others on doctrinal and other questions from 1745 to 1751, when it reached a crisis in the association at Llanidloes. At Trevecca, Harris erected a "Great House," and a settled family was formed there, a kind of brotherhood who were maintained by their mutual labours. In the large house a numerous family from all parts of Wales was gathered, and in this house he carried on his ministry. In the year 1755 the family numbered about 120. Some were possessed of means and others were poor. He preached two or three times daily in this house. This peculiar arrangement of his is regarded by most as the great blunder of his life and interfered with his itinerant work, for which he was eminently fitted. In 1760 Harris became an officer in the Breconshire Militia, and was made a captain when the regiment was embodied and marched to Yarmouth and other places. During this period he preached the gospel wherever he went. At the end of three years, when the war with France was over, Harris returned to Trevecca and resumed his labours, and continued there during the rest of his life and worked in harmony with the vicar, the movement still being regarded as within the National Church. He died 21st July, 1773, and some 20,000 persons attended his funeral.

The noted Lady Huntingdon became connected with the movement. In 1748 she and her daughters and other noble ladies left Bath, where she usually resided, and made a tour through Wales. Several of the most distinguished Methodist ministers accompanied her from Bristol in her tour. For fifteen

days two of the ministers preached every day at one or more towns or villages through which they passed. In Cardiganshire she was visited by the eminent Independent minister, Philip Pugh, previously mentioned. The tour ended at Trevecca, where many awakened clergymen, pious Dissenting ministers, and lay preachers came and had interviews with the distinguished lady. During her stay there of several days there was preaching four or five times a day to crowded congregations, gathered from the district around. Much power attended the preaching. Howell Harris had long been acquainted with Lady Huntingdon, and now he became a kind of chaplain to her, and he regularly supplied her places of worship in London, Brighton, and elsewhere. About twenty years after this tour Lady Huntingdon resolved to establish a seminary or a college to prepare devoted young men for the Christian ministry, not in connection with any particular denomination. The students were to be at liberty to take orders in the Church of England or to become ministers in any Dissenting denomination. She fixed upon Trevecca as the place where her college was to be erected. The building was prepared by Howell Harris. The building was opened as a college and the chapel for preaching the gospel in the year 1768 by Rev. George Whitfield. The Rev. J. Fletcher, of Madeley, was made the president. John Wesley visited Trevecca and preached there and administered the sacrament in August, 1769. Many of the leading Methodists, English and Welsh, took a part in the preaching and the services at this time—the first anniversary of the college—and Lady Huntingdon was present. In the year 1770 the great Calvinistic controversy began. This led to the entire separation of the Wesleyan Methodists and the Calvinistic Methodists. The Welsh Methodists were mostly of the Calvinistic order.

Lady Huntingdon died in the year 1791, and the college which she erected at Trevecca was soon after removed to Cheshunt, where it has remained ever since. The Calvinistic Methodists of Wales were without any seminary or college for the training of their ministers until the year 1837, when the college for North Wales was established by the two brothers-in-law, the Rev. Lewis Edwards, M.A., who had studied at Edinburgh, and the Rev. David Charles, B.A., who had studied at Oxford, and was the grandson of the distinguished Thomas Charles, of Bala. In the year 1842 the old building at Trevecca was handed over to the Methodists and the college was reconstituted at Trevecca under the presidency of Rev. David Charles.

The labours of the Methodists and of the Nonconformists proper in Wales continued to prosper, and the people, previously ignorant and irreligious, gradually became instructed and greatly changed in moral character and life. Individual clergymen of the National Church took a part in the revival movement as at the first, and continued to regard it as a beneficial awakening within the Church. There were fluctuations in the movement, action and

reaction, as might have been expected. Differences of opinion arose on some speculative and metaphysical dogmas, which led to sharp controversy. In the year 1770 Rev. Peter Williams brought out a quarto edition of the Bible in Welsh with marginal references, of which 8,600 copies were issued, and nine years later another edition of 6,400 copies. Several editions have since been published. This Bible became the Family Bible of the Welsh people.

The doctrinal questions respecting the nature of Christ originating in the speculations of Rev. Peter Williams led to much unpleasantness. Howell Harris, of Trevecca, and Daniel Rowlands, vicar of Llangeitho, disagreed, and in 1751 a separation took place, but the practical work continued to prosper. An important person arose in the latter part of the 18th century who exerted a great influence on the development of Welsh Methodism. This was Thomas Charles, known afterwards as the Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala. He was born 14th October, 1755, in the parish of Llanvihangel, in the county of Caermarthen. When fourteen years of age he was sent to the Presbyterian college at Caermarthen. In his eighteenth year, in the year 1773, he heard the venerable Daniel Rowlands, and the sermon changed the course of his moral and spiritual life. In the year 1775 he was sent to Oxford, and in 1778 he was ordained a deacon and appointed a curate in Somersetshire. He ultimately settled at Bala. He served as curate at several places, but his strong Methodistic propensities were objected to, and in the year 1785 he formally went over to the Methodists. This formed an era in the history of the Methodists. D. Rowlands, of Llangeitho, said of him, "Mr. Charles is the gift of God to North Wales." In addition to preaching, Mr. Charles tried to continue the work of the late Griffith Jones, whose schools had now largely disappeared. He found that scarcely one in twenty could read the Scriptures. The people of North Wales were even more ignorant than those in the south. He began by employing one teacher and then advanced to twenty. They travelled from place to place, and set up a school in each place. He established Sabbath and night schools, and by these means and the constant preaching of the gospel religious knowledge was spread in every direction.

The Sunday-school system established in England by Robert Raikes, of Gloucester, in the year 1780, was introduced into Wales mainly by Thomas Charles, and was soon established in almost every place and in connection with nearly every congregation, and has continued to the present day with increasing usefulness. The Sunday schools in Wales have differed from those in England in some important respects. In England Sunday-schools have been attended almost entirely by children. The only exceptions have been the Bible classes for young men and young women, formed in some places as a kind of supplement to the Sunday-schools. In Wales, however, the Sunday-schools have been attended by adults as well as children. In some schools the majority of the

scholars are over fifteen years of age, and include aged men and women. They attend the school to study the Scriptures. In the early history of the schools the object was to learn to read and afterwards to understand the meaning of the writing. These classes of adults sometimes assumed the form of theological classes in which were discussed the main dogmas of the Christian religion, such as the fall of man, the Divinity of Christ, the atonement, justification by faith, regeneration and sanctification! This kind of school was more common in the interior of the country and among the purely Welsh-speaking people than on the borders, where English was the speech of the people, but soon there it did exist to some extent. The present condition of things at the close of the nineteenth century is somewhat modified. The progress of elementary education, nowhere more conspicuous than in Wales, has in recent times to some extent altered the form of the schools. The peculiarity just described explains how it came to pass that during the nineteenth century the common people of Wales have been more instructed in religion than the same class in England.

It has been shown that for a long time the Methodist Revival was regarded by its promoters as a spiritual movement within the National Church, and was led by ordained clergymen. This, however, could not be continued. The Anglican Church in olden times never learnt the lesson of turning a spiritual and perhaps irregular movement into Church channels and including it within the broad limits of Church organisation. On the contrary, the bishops and the majority of the clergy discouraged such a movement, and, supported by the gentry, prosecuted the leading ministers as schismatics and heretics. By this treatment the Methodists, as previously the Nonconformists, were driven out of the Church. The consequence was that Wales has become "a nation of Nonconformists." The Methodists were accustomed to take the sacrament at the parish churches where the clergyman was anything like a good man, and they did not recognise an unordained preacher as qualified to administer the rite. In the early part of the nineteenth century they had became numerous, and the churches open to them were few and at great distances. The question was then pressed upon them whether they should not ordain men of their own body for the complete work of the ministry. This was opposed by some, and even for a time by Mr. Charles, of Bala. Some of the Methodists already went to the dissenting chapel and there partook of the sacrament. Some Methodist congregations took the matter into their own hands, ordained ministers for themselves, and thus became independent churches. It was resolved at an association held at Bala to have ordained ministers of their own. A letter was addressed to their brethren in South Wales on the subject. The association for South Wales met at Swansea in the year 1810, and the important question came before them. After a long and sharp discussion the association adopted the decision of the Bala association. In the year 1811 (June) the association met again at Bala, and eight

of the North Wales preachers were ordained. In August of the same year the South Wales association met at Llandilo Fawr and thirteen preachers were ordained. There were present at the Bala association about three hundred representatives of the Methodist Churches. The ordination was conducted by ordained clergymen, Mr. T. Charles being the chief. Questions to the number of twenty were put to the ministers about to be ordained involving doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters.

The next stage in the movement was the settlement of the constitution, the rules, and the confession of faith for the denomination or the Methodist Church. The form of government was essentially Presbyterian. The unit is the individual society or church, which possessed self-government, subject to the higher body of the monthly meeting of the county association, and above this the quarterly meeting of the province. Subsequently a general assembly of the denomination was established, possessing the power of final decision. The confession of faith was not finally and fully adopted till the year 1823, which took place at the general association at Aberystwith on the 11th of March of that year. The confession consisted of forty-four articles considered to be in general harmony with the Articles of the Church of England and the Westminster Confession of Faith, and possessed a strongly Calvinistic texture.

From this time forward the Welsh Methodists became a distinct denomination, or church, possessing and exercising all the powers and functions of a self-governing body. The circumstances of their history and the conduct of the National Church led to this result. In the exercise of their power they have gone on increasing in energy and number during the nineteenth century. The formation of the ministry was gradual. Only a small number of their preachers were recognised as ministers, and fewer still as *pastors*. The ministers for many years were intinerant. Their most talented preachers travelled from place to place and preached in every village and town. By this method the most influential ministers became known to all the churches and exercised a power immensely greater than was possible if confined to one sphere of labour. In more recent times the ministers have become more numerous and better educated. Their best men have been sent to the universities of Scotland and some to Oxford. Pastorates have become more common, especially in populous places, but the itinerant method has not been entirely abandoned. The denomination has been developed and expanded. The ministers and people are now broader and more liberal than formerly. Foreign and Home Missions have been organised independently of other denominations. The Bible Society, suggested originally by Mr. Charles, of Bala, has been most generously supported by them. The ministers of this nineteenth century may differ from those of the previous century, but many of them have been men of great talent and some of them of learning. After Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala, the great leader in this century, the name of Rev.

John Elias was the most conspicuous. He was one of the first company ordained in the year 1811, and he continued his most powerful ministry until 1842, when he died at his home in Anglesey. He began to preach as early as in the year 1794. He was perhaps in Wales the greatest preacher of his time. He had a splendid voice, a powerful utterance, a wonderful expression, and exercised a tremendous influence over his audiences. He often preached in the open air, in a field, to immense congregations, ranging from 5,000 to 20,000, and could easily be heard by them all. No other man led so many men from sin and irreligion to Christianity and a godly life. More recent ministers of eminence in the same denomination were Dr. Henry Rees, Dr. Edwards, father and son, Dr. Owen Thomas, and David Charles Davies. Henry Rees was a very popular and powerful preacher; Owen Thomas a thoughtful and learned theologian, and had one of the finest private libraries in the kingdom; David Charles Davies was a gentleman and a scholar and a striking preacher.

Whilst the Welsh or Calvinistic Methodists were organising and multiplying the other Nonconformists, Independents, Baptists, and Wesleyans were making corresponding advances. The Wesleyans extended from England. John Wesley visited Wales, and during his life there were some Wesleyans in the principality. The denomination, however, was organically established in North Wales in the last year of the eighteenth century (see "History of Wesleyan Methodism," vol. ii., by Dr. G. Smith). In the conference of 1800 Rev. Dr. Coke, a native of Wales, proposed that a mission should be sent to the Welsh-speaking people of Wales—two ministers, John Hughes and Owen Davies were appointed. They had been preceded by a layman returning from Manchester to his native country—Edward Jones, of Bethavern, in the vale of Clwyd. They were succeeded by other ministers year after year. They fixed upon Ruthin, in North Wales, as their headquarters. The first Wesleyan chapel was built at Denbigh in the year 1801. From that time the denomination made gradual progress. Their Arminian theology (salvation possible for all) had attractions for many who were repelled by rigid Calvinism. They never, however, took the same hold on the Welsh population as the older denominations. There were at this time more Quakers in Wales than there are now. The other smaller sects which abound in England have never made much progress in Wales. Besides the Church of England four denominations have prevailed in the country, namely, the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Welsh Methodists, and the Wesleyans.

The earliest leaders of the Congregationalists have been previously described. In the nineteenth century they have had many able ministers, too numerous to be mentioned here. In North Wales there was Williams of Wern, a man of great ability, of profound thought and power, who left behind him a great reputation. There were the Roberts of Llanbrynmair, father and sons,

Samuel and John, men of character and usefulness. Dr. William Rees, the brother of Henry Rees, was a man of great ability, a leader of men, a preacher and a thinker. In South Wales the Rev. Dr. T. Rees, of Swansea, the author of "The History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales," was a man of much power in the pulpit and on the platform. He had a splendid physique, a fine voice, and could easily be heard in Welsh or English by 10,000 people in the open air. Rev. Thomas Jones, of Swansea, then of London and of Australia, and finally of Swansea, was a great preacher, not noisy nor boisterous, but full of the poetic spirit of pathos and power, at home in English and Welsh, the same sermons affecting to tears the Welsh and the English audience alike.

The Baptists of Wales had also their men of talent and renown. The most remarkable man of the century was Christmas Evans, of North Wales, a man of genius, with great power of imagination expressed in his sermons in the imaginary dialogues characteristic of the Welsh preaching of the times. All these men of various denominations were giants, and exerted an immense influence over the people of Wales, by which they have been raised from ignorance and spiritual deadness to their present state of knowledge and life. The Church of England in Wales has also made much progress during the nineteenth century, especially during the latter half. Its condition now (1900) is very different from what it was in the beginning of the century or even fifty years ago. There is more spiritual life and much greater activity. The clergy are a great improvement on what they were. Formerly they were often non-resident and the work of the parish was left to a curate. This is no longer the case, and the clergy are as zealous as any Nonconformist ministers. In some places the English Church is fairly strong. The large landlords and most of the smaller gentry are churchmen. The great majority of the professional classes also profess to belong to the National Church. The vast majority of the farmers and tradesmen and the working class are Dissenters. Some of the best of the clergy seem to anticipate that before long there will be a return to the unity of the Church. There is, however, no evidence of this. The stiff formality of the Anglican Church does not suit the plain methods and spirit of the Welsh people generally. Some of the clergy seem disposed to imitate the ritualism of England, and in doing so they contribute to drive farther from the Church the people of Wales. There is not the slightest ground for believing that the Welsh people will ever again become the slaves of superstition and subject themselves to the domination of any priesthood, Roman or Anglican. There is room in Wales as in England for Conformists and Nonconformists, and the truest policy is to cultivate the spirit of mutual toleration and brotherly feeling. No other course of conduct will succeed. Their emulation should be to present to the people the purest and the most powerful form of Christianity, and to bring them to the experience and practice of the loftiest kind of the Christian life.

The National Government in recent times has treated Wales and the Welsh Church with greater fairness. In olden times the bishops appointed to the Welsh sees were mostly Englishmen ignorant of the language and the people, as shown in previous pages. In a recent work, "The History of the Church in Wales," by Rev. H. W. Clarke, the calculation has been made that since the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth to the year 1890 there were 119 bishops appointed to the four Welsh sees, and of those seventy-nine were Englishmen and three Scotch. This is now changed.

A controversy has sometimes been carried on in Wales as to the relative strength of the National Church and the Free Churches. The most recent statistics of the Free Churches in Wales that have come under our observation show that the Congregationalists have—Chapels, 1,281; sitting accommodation, 418,549; and members or communicants, 143,425. The Baptists, 813 chapels; accommodation, 342,710; and members, 101,057. The Wesleyans had 41,373 members. The Calvinistic Methodists are given as 1,523 chapels, 153,712 members, but these figures embrace the Welsh places in the English towns. In Wales alone the Welsh Methodists are about the same number as the Congregationalists—larger in North Wales, but smaller in South Wales. In the whole of Wales the Free Churches have about 420,000 members. The numbers of course vary every year. In the year 1894 the Church Year Book gave the number of Church communicants as 120,427 in Wales. If all these figures are approximately correct, the members or the communicants of all the leading denominations are about 540,000; and of the whole those of the National Church, 120,427 are more than one-fifth but less than one-fourth. These figures do not include the smaller denominations, which are not numerous in Wales. From the figures thus presented the Welsh people may fairly be called a nation of Nonconformists. In some discussions on the relative strength of the National Church we have observed that the word *members*, commonly used by the Nonconformists, has been treated by onesided partisans as identical with adherents, but this is not correct. Among the Nonconformists, members or Church members correspond with the communicants in the National Church, and are not numerically half the adherents. The adherents of the National Church in Wales have been estimated by Mr. Clarke as 354,290 out of a population of nearly 1,800,000. The adherents of the four chief Dissenting denominations will be approximately a million. These are the best estimates available, which, however, may be taken as substantially correct, though absolute accuracy cannot be attained.

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE INTELLECTUAL HISTORY OF WALES FROM THE SIXTEENTH TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

It is now generally admitted by fair-minded Englishmen who understand the subject that the British or, as they are now called, the Welsh people have from the earliest times shown that they possessed much intellectual power, and that their literature is amongst the most ancient of Western Europe. It was once the fashion amongst superficial but fine English writers to represent the ancient Britons as barbarians or semi-barbarians, an inferior race in every respect. This method of treating the Celtic people can no longer be maintained. That the ancient Britons in the times of Julius Cæsar and Claudius and anterior to their days were ignorant and superstitious is only saying what may be said of the European nations generally. With the exception of the Greeks and the Romans, the Britons 2,000 years ago were equal to any other nation of Europe. They possessed a literature subsequently, when the Anglo-Saxons were steeped in ignorance and idolatry. In the sixth and seventh centuries, during the continuous wars of the Anglo-Saxon aggression, the literature of the Britons was almost at its best. The distinguished bards Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch Hen, and Merlin then flourished. The period from the death of Cadwaladr the Blessed, about 664, to the end of the eleventh century was one of intellectual retrogression. On this point Thomas Stephens, in his "Literature of the Kymry," p. 396, remarks: "It is utterly inconsistent with our knowledge of human history to suppose that the national mind of Wales would have been for any lengthened period inactive; we may, therefore, conclude that the long and barren period which intervenes between the death of Cadwaladr and the arrival of Gruffydd ab Kynan could not have been wholly unproductive. The bards were engaged in recording the actions of their countrymen, which, becoming more and more known, became more and more glorious. Plain facts were embellished into glorious fictions; brave warriors became great heroes; and Arthur, an insignificant chieftain in the sixth century, grew into a valorous warrior in the eighth, and by the twelfth had become emperor of the whole civilised world. This growth of traditions is plainly evident in the works of Nennius, Geoffrey, and Alanus de Insulis; and, as has been well remarked, there is as much differ-

ence between Gildas and Nennius as there is between Nennius and Geoffrey. Fable had grown in the intervals." In another part of his work (p. 427) Stephens states that "the poems of Llywarch Hen and Aneurin seem to show a higher state of civilisation than prevailed many centuries later, and clearly show the condition of Britain at the close of the Roman domination, when the civilised practices of their conquerors had won their admiration and elicited their sympathy."

After the long and barren period referred to the Welsh intellect had a revival of activity from the time of Gruffydd ab Cynan. During this period such bards as Gwalchmai and Kynddelw arose and revived the vigour of ancient times. After this period came the final conquest of Wales by the Normans. English kings and liberty departed, and the Welsh mind went to sleep for another long period until after the Reformation. The religious revival in Wales in the early part of the eighteenth century gave a great stimulus to the mental activity of the Welsh people. The Welsh mind has been open to healthy influences mostly on its religious side. It has shown its capacity for any mental work to which circumstances have directed it, but it has been most powerfully moved by appeals to its spiritual nature. The Welsh intellect has been through all the ages largely philosophical or, as sometimes designated, metaphysical and theological. It has not had the chance of attaining to eminence in science in the strict sense of the word. It has been dependent on England and on the English language for its knowledge of science. Individual Welshmen have distinguished themselves as scientists, but the national mind has not until lately had the opportunity or the means of much scientific progress. The poetic spirit has been cultivated and developed among the Britons from the earliest times. Sympathy with nature has led to imagination and to a devout inquiry into the forces which produce the wonderful phenomena of the natural world, and to the supernatural power which transcends material nature. The religious or the spiritual nature has been intensely cultivated, and this has led to intellectual activity in other directions. The almost exclusive devotion of the mind to the study of material nature has a one-sided tendency to materialism, or to the deification of matter as the ultimatum of being. This has been exhibited in the case of many scientists in England and France. The Welsh mind has never been tempted to this one-sided development. To the Welsh mind nature has been regarded as the revelation of the Divine mind. The Bible by Welshmen has been treated as containing the revelation of the mind of God in relation to sin and redemption; and the system of nature has been recognised equally as containing a revelation of God's nature and will on a larger and different scale. To the Welsh poetic and philosophic spirit nature is contemplated as full of thought, the expression of the eternal and infinite mind of God. The revival of religion led to mental activity, not only in relation to the Eternal Spirit and the human soul, but in other directions.

The translation of the Bible into the Welsh language laid the foundation of the religion of Wales in modern times. The impulse to know the contents of the Bible led to the desire to learn to read generally, and this was illustrated in the "circulating schools" established by Rev. Griffith Jones in the beginning of the eighteenth century and subsequently by Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala. Then followed the Sunday-schools at the close of the eighteenth century, which have done during a hundred years more than anything else to teach the Welsh people, young and old, to read and to understand the great truths of the Christian religion. The books and periodicals written and printed in the Welsh language or relating to Wales for the last three centuries are very numerous. The late Rev. William Rowlands, a Wesleyan minister in Wales, prepared during his life an account of the books printed in the Welsh language, or relating to Wales, from the year 1546 to the end of the eighteenth century. It was published after his death by Mr. John Pryse at Llanidloes, and it was edited and enlarged by Rev. D. Silvan Evans, under the title of Cambrian Bibliography, in 1869. It is a considerable volume of over seven hundred pages. On the basis of this work it has been shown that the number of such works amounted to over 2,400. In the nineteenth century, according to Mr. Charles Ashton, of Dynas Mawddwy, quoted in the Blue Book, no less than 11,613 books of every description have been issued in Welsh, or relating to Wales. The first printing press set up in Wales was in the year 1719. Most of the books pertaining to the principality before this time were printed in London. Many of the large number of books described were no doubt small and unimportant, but they indicate the great and increasing literary activity of the Welsh people. Mr. Pryse remarks in his address to the reader of Rowlands' great book: "Now and then an English penny-a-liner has declared that 'there is nothing in Welsh worth reading.' To assertions of that kind the pages which follow will form the most effective reply." The most important modern books written by Welshmen have been published in the English language. The literature printed in Welsh is mainly periodical reviews and magazines. Standard works and most newspapers appear in English. This is increasingly so. The English language is becoming the most universal organ of communication of thought in trade, commerce, and literature, and is gradually spreading in Wales. This is evident from the returns of the census of 1891. The population of Wales then, including Monmouthshire, was 1,776,405. Of this number there were returned as speaking only English, 759,416; speaking only Welsh 508,036, and speaking both languages 402,253; speaking foreign languages, 3,076; infants under two years, 90,791; and 12,833 no information given. Since then the English language has continued to spread. Those who spoke English only were more numerous than those who spoke Welsh only. The Welsh speaking is evidently decreasing, and the English increasing. In 1801, according to Mr. Darlington's

estimates, the residents in Wales who could speak English only were from 100,000 to 120,000, or about 20 per cent. of the population. In 1891 the English-speaking were 45 per cent. of the whole. The population in ninety years trebled itself. The Welsh-speaking doubled and the English-speaking increased sevenfold. In ages gone by the English Governments tried by force to suppress the Welsh language and failed ; in the nineteenth century, when the language has not been interfered with by the Government, but left to its own natural development, English has increased and continues to spread. Wales is rapidly becoming a bilingual country. The next generation will be able to speak only English or both English and Welsh. The majority of the people now prefer to use Welsh in their churches and chapels, even when they use English in business and in every-day transactions. It is probable that the people will long continue to use their native tongue and also the commercial and literary language of England.

The revival of the institution—the Eisteddfod—now called the Royal Eisteddfod of Wales, has given a considerable stimulus to the literary activity of the Welsh people. It was established in imitation of the gatherings of the ancient bards of Wales, but of course it is a very different thing from the original. It must in the nature of the case be so. There are no real bards in the nineteenth century like those who flourished in the sixth and seventh centuries or in the twelfth century. There are poets of some sorts in abundance, but there are no true bards. The bards of ancient times constituted a profession, and were an exclusive body. This could not be re-created in the nineteenth century, which is essentially a democratic age. The institutions of ancient days cannot be restored in their own peculiar form, though the essential spirit may be revived. The modern Eisteddfod expresses the essential spirit of the ancient bards in a modern form. It calls to mind some features of ancient Welsh civilisation, and renders great service to the present generation. In the early years of its modern existence it was neglected, or ridiculed, by the London press, but it has continued to live and prosper, and has obtained the patronage of royalty and the notice of the English press generally. The London press is not always wise and discriminating, and sometimes it has to alter its tone and conduct without condescending to confess its faults. The Welsh Eisteddfod is very popular, and has already done much to promote the literary education of the Welsh people. It has promoted the art of music to a large extent. The bards were essentially poetic and musical, and in promoting the cultivation of music the modern Eisteddfod has entered into the spirit of the ancient bards. The Welsh language may seem to Englishmen unacquainted even with the Welsh alphabet to be uncouth, but it is really poetic, and lends itself powerfully to musical performances. Welsh music is popular, and their choirs have been most successful even in London.

The progress of education in Wales during the latter half of the nineteenth century has been very great. The system of national education in England, gradually made compulsory, was of course extended to Wales, and nowhere has it produced better results. The School Board system, which is undenominational, is eminently adapted to Wales, a country of Dissenters. Extreme Dissenters have injured its reputation and prevented its almost universal adoption by excluding from its curriculum all religious education, and even the Bible, so loved by the Welsh people. This policy has not sprung from opposition to religious education itself, but from the abstract opinion that the State has nothing to do with religion, an application of the dogma which is contrary to the practice of the London School Board and most others. The spread of elementary education in Wales is now immense, and thereby the knowledge and the use of the English language are becoming general. In another generation there will be scarcely any one in Wales who will be ignorant of English.

The promotion of secondary education has recently been great in the principality. There have been some grammar schools in Wales for a long period, but until lately they were abused and mismanaged, as in England. A great improvement has taken place in recent times in their constitution and management. Theological colleges have been created and maintained by the leading religious denominations during the nineteenth century. The Church of England established the college of St. David's at Lampeter, in Cardiganshire, in the year 1827, and by its means many Welshmen, unable to go to the English Universities, have been trained for the National Church in Wales. The Congregationalists have two colleges, one at Brecon and the other at Bangor. The Baptists have one in South Wales and one in North Wales. The Calvinistic Methodists have one at Trevecca and one at Bala. These are all theological colleges engaged in the work of training men for the Christian ministry.

A very important step in the educational progress of Wales was made by the establishment of university colleges in different places. The college at Aberystwith was the first of those promoted by a few earnest Welshmen, including Sir Hugh Owen and J. F. Roberts (1872). After struggling with many financial difficulties the Government was induced to make in 1882 an annual grant of £4,000. The first principal of this college, long before the grant was made, was Rev. Dr. Charles, a descendant of Thomas Charles, of Bala. To him succeeded his nephew, Rev. Dr. Thomas Charles Edwards. The movement among Welshmen for the establishment of university colleges in Wales did not end at Aberystwith, but was continued, and resulted in the establishment of a college at Cardiff in 1883, and another at Bangor in 1884. Large sums of money were raised in Wales towards the formation of these colleges, a royal charter was granted to each, and a Parliamentary grant of £4,000 per annum. To complete the system of higher education it was felt that Wales should have a university

with the power of conferring degrees after strict examination. This important point was gained, and in 1893 the Charter passed both Houses of Parliament constituting the University of Wales on the basis of the three colleges. The first chancellor was the late Lord Aberdare, and after his death, as was most fit, the Prince of Wales was made the chancellor. Ever since the university colleges and the university itself have made continuous progress, and are rendering immense service to the intellectual development of the principality. Welshmen, as Scotchmen and Irishmen, may now obtain the highest form of education and a genuine degree within the limits of their own country.

The education imparted to children in the elementary schools did not fully prepare them for the higher education of the university colleges. The old grammar schools were too few to secure a sufficient intermediate course of education in the country generally. A movement was started for securing this object. In the year 1889 the Intermediate Education (Wales) Act was passed. This Act gave power to the County Councils of Wales to levy a rate of a halfpenny in the pound for the promotion of secondary education. By these means schemes for secondary education have been framed and are in operation through the principality. This system was completed in the year 1896 by the creation of a central board, which was to have a general jurisdiction, especially in reference to funds for scholarships and exhibitions.

Thus Wales at the close of the nineteenth century is provided with the means of education in every department to an extent not surpassed in any other part of the United Kingdom. After ages of injustice and neglect, Wales is now in the enjoyment of political and educational benefits which place her on an equality with England and bid fair to give a great impulse to the educational development of her people.

INDEX

A

Abbess of Leominster, 184
Aber, Palace of King, 292–8
Aberfraw, 106, 271
Aberystwith, 119
Adda, 145
Adelfius, Bishop, 81
Adminius, 52
Aetdd Mawr, 5
Agricola, 20, 61
Agrippina, Empress, 60
Albans, St., 75
Albion, 2
Alcluyd, or Dumbarton, 102
Alfred the Great, 127, 148, 149, 169
Allectus, 71
Alnet, Treaty of, 276
Ancient Laws of Wales, 192–9
Anderida, or Pevensey, 92
Andredsweald, 92
Aneurin, 101, 123
Angles, 90, 94, 97
Anglesey, 258, 263
Anne, Queen, 133
Antoninus Pius, 69
Aquæ Solis, or Bath, 76, 98
Aquitania, 11
Archbishop of Canterbury, 289
Aristobulus, 79
Arles Council, 17, 110
Armorica, 11, 127
Arnobius Junior, 81
Arthur, King, 93, 94
Aryan, 6, 9
Aryan Polytheism, 35
Asaph, St., 120
Asclepiodotus, 71
Asser, 147
Athelstan, King, 133, 150
Athelney, 169
Augusta, or London, 75
Augustine, 121
Aurelius Ambrosianus, 91
Avebury, 14

B

Badon Hill Battle, 94, 97
Bæda, Venerable, 141
Baldwin, Bishop, 240
Balerion, 3
Ball, John, 355
Bamborough, 161
Bangor Iscoed, 114
Bardic literature, 321–325
Barons and the King, 273
Basingwerk Castle, 261
Basque and Lapp, 1
Beaumaris, 353
Bellows, John, 55
Bernicia, 95
Bible in Wales, translation, 380
Bishops, English, in Wales, 342, 381–4
Bleddyn, 129
Boadicea, 63, 64, 65
Books in Wales, 405
Boulogne, 44
Bretwalda, 127
Brigantes, 60
Britain and Brutus, Br-itan-ia, 1, 2, 6
Britannia, Prima and Secunda, 75
Brochwal, 129
Brunanburg, 158
Bryn-y-Pin, strong position, 258
Brythons, 5, 12
Brythons Druids, 35
Builth, Llewelyn died here, 298
Bund, Mr., author, 327–330

C

Cadavan, 159
Cadell ab Gruffydd, 233
Cadwaladr, 106
Cælestius, 114
Caer, 76
Caer Caradoc, 60
Caerleon Isca, 61, 271
Caerphilly, 251, 354
Cæsar, Julius, 4, 29, 33, 39, 400
Calais, 44

Caledonians, 68, 70, 86
Caligula, 52
Cambrian Bibliography, 405
Camden, Britannia, 134
Camulodunum, or Colchester, 52, 75
Cantium, or Kent, 51
Canute, 153
Caractacus, or Caradoc, 52, 55, 59
Carausius, 71
Carlyle's Letters, &c., of Cromwell, 371
Carthage and Donatists, 81
Carthaginians, 4
Cartismandua, 60
Cassius, Dio, historian, 64
Caswallon, or Cassivelaunus, 49
Cataracton, 101
Cattraeth, 95
Catus, 64
Ceawlin, 98
Cefn Digoll, 353
Celtic race and language, 6, 7
Celts, 5
Ceolric, 100
Ceolwulph, 146
Cerdic, 93
Cerialis Petilius, 64–5
Charford, 93
Charles of Bala, 397
Charles I., 371
Chepstow, 243
Chester destroyed 613, 109
Chichester, 92
Chippenham, 169
Christianity in Britain, 78
Church of Wales, 326–343, 378
Cil Owain, the Retreat of Owain, 258
Cinque Ports, 294
Cissa, 92
Classicianus, 65
Claudius, 53–6, 60
Clergy, Welsh, 384
Climate of Britain, 24
Clun River, 59
Coed Eulo, 257
Colleges and Schools in Wales, 407
Columba, 162
Comes Littoris Saxonici, 71, 85
Commius the Gaul, 44, 52
Constantine, Great, 71
Constantius, 71, 113
Conway, 266
Coracle, or Welsh boat, 30, 31
Corfe Castle, 152
Corinium, or Cirencester, 98
Corman, 159
Cornwall, 98, 99, 134
Corwen, Welsh forces meet, 261
Cotswold, 98
Craddock, Walter, 385
Crayford, 91
Crida, 95
Cromwell, 371
Crusades, 240
Cumberland, 97
Cumbria and Strathclyde, 102, 134
Cunedda, 13, 103
Cymen, 92
Cymry, 2, 5
Cynetæ, 2
Cynobeline, 52
Cynric, 93
Cyveiliog, 242

D

Dalriadian, 163
Danegelt, 179
Danes, 166
Daniel, 118
Darvernum, or Canterbury, 76
David, St., 117, 118
Davies, D.C., 400
Davies, Howell, 391
Davydd, second son of Llewelyn, 275
Dawkins, Boyd, 25
Death of Llewelyn, 298
Deheubarth, 129
Deira, 95
Demetæ, 20
Denbigh, Battle, 353
Deva, or Chester, 74
Devonshire, 97, 132–3
Didius Gallus, 61
Diganwy, 266, 278
Dinas Bran, or Crow Castle, 282
Dinevwr, 271
Diocletian, 110–1
Diodorus Siculus, 3
Dissenting Churches, 387
Dobuni, or Bodmin, 55
Draoithe, equal wisemen, 36
Druidical Priests and Religion, 14, 34–40
Druidical Remains, 14
Druidism, its nature, 36
Druidism, the religion of Aborigines, 35
Dubræ, or Dover, 76
Dubricius, 118
Dumnonii, 94
Dumnonium, 18
Dunstan, 175, 176
Durham, 97, 98, 128
Dux Britanniarum, 87
Dyfed, 106, 119
Dyfnwal Moelmud, 6, 129

E

East Saxons, 94
Ebbsfleet, 90
Edgar, 151
Edmund, 145
Edwards, Lewis, 396
Edwin, 145
Einion
Eisteddfod, Royal, 406
Elfgar, 184–5
Elias, John, 400

Elizabeth, Queen, 99
Ella, 92
Erbury, W., 385
Ercenwine, 94
Esc, 92
Ethelbert, 121
Eusebius, 81
Evans, Dr. John, 389
Evans, Christmas, 401
Evesham, battle of, 286
Exeter, 133

F

Faddiley, 99
Fethanleag, 99
Firth of Forth and Clyde, 69
Flamddwyn Flameman, 95
Flavia Cæsariensis. 75
Flemings of Pembroke, 183, 226, 228
Forest of Dean, 24, 25
Forests, British, 25
French Troops in Wales, 362, 363
Frethern, 99

G

Gadarn, Hugh, 5
Galgacus, 68
Galloway, 68
Gam, David, 359
Gaulish epoch, 17
Gauls and Britons, 43
Gauls and Druidism, 39
Gavelkind, 260
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 79
Gerard of Windsor, 225
Germanus, 115
Gilbert, Earl of Gloucester, 244
Gildas, 106
Giraldus Cambrensis, 305
Glappia, 145
Glastonbury, 117
Gloucester, 283
Gloucester, or Glevum, 55
Glyndwr, Owain, 356
God and Druidism, 40
Godwin, Earl, 180
Goidels, 6, 11, 13
Gower, 225
Green, historian, 32
Gregory the Great, 120
Gruffydd ab Cynan, 230, 259
Gruffydd ab Rhys, 230
Guest, Dr., 54, 94, 98
Guthrum, 169
Gwalchmai, poet, 259
Gwent, Venta, 25, 26, 129
Gwyddyl, 106
Gwynedd, 107

H

Haddon and Stubbs, 79
Hadrian, 69
Hamilco, 3
Hardicanute, 180
Harris, Howell, 390
Hebrew, 8
Hebrides, 176
Helena, 71
Hengist, 89
Henry II., a new era, 257
Henry III., 275
Henry VII., Tudor dynasty, 364
Hereford, 282–4
Herodotus, 2
Hilary, Bishop, 81
Honorius, Emperor, 85
Horsa, 90
Horsted, 91
Hotspur, Percy, 361
Houses, British, 30
Hübner, Dr., 55
Huntingdon, Lady, 395
Howel Dda, 190, 200–2
Howel Drwg, 203
Howel Vychan, 186

I

Iberians, 10, 12
Ina, King, 117
Iorwerth, 225
Iron Trade, 24

J

Joan, Queen, died, 274
John, King, 264
Jones, Edmund, 388
Jones, Griffith, 391
Jones, Thomas, 401
Jutes, 90, 91

K

Kentigern, 162
Kerry, 270
Kidweli, 225
Kynddylan, 98

L

Languages not made, 10
Lapps, 9
Legion's composition, 77
Lincoln, Bishop, 81
Lincoln, Earl of, 353
Lindum, or Lincoln, 145
Lindiswar, 145
Literature of the Welsh, 301–320
Llanbadarn, 119
Llancarvan, 116
Llandaff, 119, 120
Llandewi Brevi, 116
Llanilltyd, 116

Llanafan, 120
Llanstephan, 232
Llewelyn ab Iorwerth, 246–253, 267, 268, 274
Llwyd Humphrey, 311
Llydaw, or Britanny, 5, 6
Llywarch Hen, 101
Lodbrog, Ragnor, 166
Logria, 17
Londinium, or London, 64, 75, 292
Lucius, King, 79
Luguvallium, or Carlisle, 76
Lupus, 115
Lupus, Hugh, Earl of Chester, 254
Lyons, 80
Lyons, Church of, 326, 337
Lysons, Canon, 78

M

Maegla, 93
Madoc ab Meredydd, prince of Powys, 257
Madoc ab Morgan, 352–3
Maelgwn, 107
Maelionydd, 241
Mailgwn Vychan, 354
Malcolm, King, 137
Malmesbury, 173
Mandubratius, 50
Manlius Valens, 61
Marcellus, Nepius, 69
Marcher Lordships, 366
Marches, the, 281
Marriage, British, 31, 32
Marshes, 365–8
Martial, 78
Massacre of Danes, 178
Massilia, Marseilles, 3, 4, 80
Mathrefal, 108, 259
Maxima Cæsariensis, 75
Maximilian, 71
Meifod, 259, 271
Meilyr, poet, 258
Mellitus, 158
Menai Straits, 62
Menevia, 117
Mercia, 95
Meredydd ab Owen, 185
Merivale, Dr., 59.
Merlin, 123
Michael's Mount, St., 3
Middlesex, 97
Mold, 285
Mona Island, 62–4
Montfort, Simon de, 283
Montgomery, 259, 268, 270, 277, 287–8
Morgan of Caerleon, 353
Mortimer, E., 360
Mortimer, Roger, 241, 355
Morgant, 101
Morganwg, 129
Murdoch Moor, 68
Mutilation of hostages, 261
Mynyddawg, 101
Myvyrian Archaiology, 192

N

Navy, English, 258
Nennius,
Newtown, 386
Nicæa, 113
Non, or Nonna, 117
Nonconformity in Wales, 385–390
Norfolk, 97
Normans, 206–217
Northumbria, 95, 97
Norway, 182
Norwegians, 182–3

O

Odo, Archbishop, 177
Offa, 96, 259
Ogham Characters, 15
Old Sarum, 97
Olof, 177
Ony, River, 59
Ordovices, 13, 19
Origen of Alexandria, 80
Original Language, 9
Origines Celticæ, 54
Osburga, 147
Ostorius, 57–8, 9
Oswald, 136, 283
Oswestry, 260, 289, 353
Oswin, 162
Owain Gwynedd, 157, 263
Owen, Aneurin, 193
Oxford, 98

P

Palladius, 162
Paris, Matthew, 281
Patrick, St., 163
Paul, St., 78
Paulinus, 117
Paullinus Suetonius, 61
Pelagius, his doctrines, 82–4, 114
Pembroke, 294, 371–3
Pengwern, or Shrewsbury, 99, 259, 268
Phœnicians, 2, 4
Picts and Scots, 86
Plautius Aulus, 56
Pliny and Druidism, 37
Polybius, 3
Pomponius Mela, geographer first century, and Druidism, 41
Pomponia, 78
Portus Iccius, 44
Posidonius, 3
Powell, Dr., author, 311
Powell, Vavassor, 386
Powis Castle, or Red Castle, 373
Powys, 108, 259, 282

Prayer Book in Welsh, 380
Prehistoric villages, 27
Pryce, Canon John, 36
Pryce, Canon, Ancient British Church, 81
Prydain, Ynys, 6
Ptolemy, 20
Pudens and Claudia, 78
Pugh, Philip, 388
Pythias, 4

R

Ranulph Poer, 238
Rees, Henry, 400
Rees, T., 401
Rees, William, 401
Reformation, 369
Reged, 102
Religion of Ancient Britons, 34–40
Restitutus, Bishop, 81
Revolt in Wales, 353
Revolt in Wales and confederation of Welsh princes, 260
Rhodri Dial, 189
Rhodri Maelwynawg, 186, 259
Rhodri Mawr, 187
Rhuddlan Castle, 259
Rhun, 107
Rhydderch, 101
Rhyddmarch, 116, 118
Rhys, Professor, 12, 21, 30, 35
Rhys ab Howel, 232
Rhys ab Tewdwr, 232
Richmond, Henry, 364
Rimini Council, 114
Riots, Chartists and Rebecca, 377
Rocks of Britain, 24
Romano-British population, 97
Romano-British towns, 75–7
Romulus and Remus, 1
Roses, Wars of, 364
Rowena, 90
Rowlands, Daniel, 388
Rowlands, William, 405
Rutupiæ, or Richborough, 75
Rymer, Thomas, author, 285

S

Sandde ab Ceredig, 117
Sardica Council, 114
Saxons, 92, 94
Scilly Islands, 2
Scots, Irish tribe, 86
Severus, 70
Shetlands, Vikings, 182
Shrewsbury, 276
Silurians, 10, 11, 61, 193
Skene, author, 94
Slave, Welsh, 127
Snowdon, 296
Sodor and Man, 182
Solway Firth, 69, 102
Somersetshire, 97
South Saxons, 92, 97
Stephen, King, 257
Stephens, Thomas, 101
Stonehenge, 14
Strabo, 3
Stuf, 93
Suffolk, 97
Sweyn, 178

T

Tacitus, 10, 60, 61
Taliesin, 123
Tal-y-Moelvre, victory, 258
Tamworth, 171
Taylor, Canon, 1
Teilo, St , 120
Teme River, 59
Tertullian, 80
Testudo method of war, 48
Thanet, Isle, 90
Theodocius, 86
Thomas, Owen, 400
Tin Islands, 2
Tin Trade, 24
Titus, 57
Togodumnus, 52
Tostig, 183
Trebonius, Caius, 49
Tribes, Celtic, 16–22
Trinobantes, 50
Tudor, Sir Owen, 364
Turanians, 8
Ty-gwyn, or Whitland, 117

U

Urbicus Lollius, 69
Uffa, 95
Urien, 101

V

Vale of Crucis, 273
Valentia, 75
Venedotian Code of Laws, 192
Veneti, The, 30
Venta Belgarum, or Winchester, 76
Venta Silurum, or Caerwent, 76
Verulam, and St. Albans, 51, 75
Vespasian, 57, 66
Vipont, Robert de, 129
Volusenus, Caius, and Britain, 43
Vortigern, 89
Vortimer, 89

W

Wales, Castles, 371
Wales, Parliamentary Representation, 374, 5
Warrington, historian,

Wat Tyler, 355
Watling Street, 150
Welsh, and Welsh people, 5, 370
Welsh Language, 97
Welshpool, or Trallwm, 282, 373
West Saxons, 95, 97
West Wales, 125, 132
Westmorland, 97
Wiccii, 121–3
Widmore, 170
Wightgar, 93
Wight, Isle of, or Vectis, 71, 93
Wild Animals of Britain, 25
Wilfred, 161
Williams, William, Pantycelyn, 393
Wiltshire, 97
Wimborne, 170
Winchester, 25
Witenagemote, 190
Wlencing, 92
Woodward, historian, 101
Worcestershire, 99
Wotton, S., 192
Wroth, William, 385
Wulfstan, 173
Wynne, of Peniarth, 194

Y

York, or Eboracum, 69

Elliot Stock, Paternoster Row, London.